TAX MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

FOR

ALBERTA FARMERS

Deloitte
Haskins + Sells
Chartered Accountants

Alberta
AGRICULTURE
Farm Business Management Branch

PREFACE

Taxation is one of the major factors that influences the decisions made by the farm manager in the operation of the farm business. The implications of various tax strategies should be considered as the manager looks at the profitability, costs, investment patterns, production and projected cash flows in guiding his farm business toward economic and personal goals.

Since 1972, when the tax reform legislation became effective, we have seen many changes from year to year in the tax laws pertaining to agriculture. The result has been an increased need for an information source which the farmer can use to assist him in understanding the various tax management strategies or tools available.

This publication discusses the various tax strategy alternatives available for farmers. After having a basic understanding of the tax rules in relation to the farm business, the farm manager is better able to ask the right questions when considering an alternative. The material presented here SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS AN INTERPRETATION OR A REPLACEMENT FOR THE LEGISLATION, as changes in our tax laws are continually being made. Specific problems with respect to tax management decisions should be referred to an accountant, lawyer, or tax advisor who is aware of current changes which may have occurred since the preparation of this publication. The final decisions should be based on the exact wording of the law.

The material for this revised publication was prepared by Gordon King and Craig Jewell, Chartered Accountants, Deloitte, Haskins and Sells, Calgary.

We gratefully acknowledge the contribution of George Geldart, who prepared the original publication in 1979 while on staff of the Farm Business Management Branch. Further thanks to Harry Warne and Dan Hilsenteger, Financial Management Section, Farm Business Management Branch for their review and comments on the material developed for this publication.

Revised January, 1984

J. Wilson Loree, P.Ag.
Head
Farm Business Management Branch
Olds, Alberta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

THE INCOME TAX SYSTEM 2

FARMING – AS THE TAX MAN SEES IT 3

METHODS OF REPORTING INCOME 4
- Accrual Method 4
- Cash Method 5
- Considerations in Changing your Fiscal Year end 5
- Basic Filing Information 6
- Simplified Individual Tax Return 7

CAPITAL COST ALLOWANCE 7

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT 11
- Investment Tax Credit in a Farm Partnership 12
- Investment Tax Credit in a Corporation 12

TAX TREATMENT OF BASIC HERDS AND OTHER FARMING INVENTORIES 12
- Livestock Inventories 12
- Crop and Other Inventories 14

CAPITAL GAINS 15
- What is Capital Property 15
- Valuation Day Values 15
- Calculation of Capital Gains 17
- Capital Gain Reserves 18
- Tax Treatment of the Farm Family Home 19

INCOME AVERAGING 21
- Five-Year Block Averaging 21
- Forward Averaging 22
- Livestock Inventory Provision 23
- Registered Retirement Savings Plans 25

PROPERTY TRANSFERS 26
- Rollovers 26
- Other Federal Income Tax Consequences To Consider 29
- Selling the Farm 29
- Exchange of Property – Replacement Property Provision 31

HOBBY FARMERS 33

ORGANIZATION OF THE FAMILY FARM 35
- Sole Proprietorship 35
- Joint Venture 37
- Partnerships 37
- Corporations 38

ESTATES 41
- Wills 41
- Deemed Dispositions 41
- Actual Dispositions 42
- Rights or Things 42
- Trusts 42
- Life Estates 43
- Other Considerations 43

CONCLUSION 44

APPENDIX 45

INTRODUCTION

> Starting from the premise that our society is undergoing profound change, the tax reform is a sensitive response to changing needs. It will enable us to raise in a much fairer way the taxes we need to make Canada function. It will be more equitable not only between the various sectors of our society but also within these groups. The load will be distributed more evenly and surely so that every person and every institution able to contribute will do so according to capacity.
>
> The tax reform recognizes that we live in a private enterprise system in which effort and initiative must be rewarded if our society is to work effectively and efficiently. I believe that we have succeeded in striking a viable balance between equity and enterprise. This will enable us to get the saving and investment required for strong growth while ensuring that the less fortunate get a fair deal.[1]

With that rationale, the Government of Canada enacted Tax Reform, one of the most comprehensive pieces of legislation in the history of our country. The tax reform in 1971 resulted in numerous changes and additions to Canada's tax system. Along with this came the necessity of understanding how the tax laws affected both personal and business income taxes. This is especially true in light of the history of tax changes we have seen since tax reform. In every year since 1971, there have been some changes in the tax laws. This is very different from the situation existing before the tax reform, when the tax laws were relatively stable. Thus, the importance of keeping up-to-date and understanding our tax rules as they relate to farming is clear. This publication discusses what are felt to be the most important and significant tax strategies available to farmers as an important tool in managing the farm business.

For many people, tax management often means the necessity of filing their income tax returns come year end. Along with this, a popular goal is to get the final line on the tax form to zero. The important thing to keep in mind, as far as tax management is concerned, is that the objective should be to **maximize income after tax**, not just to minimize the tax obligations. From both a business and personal point of view, the more dollars you make, the further ahead you are. As long as you take home part of the last dollar of income, it is worth earning it. To illustrate this objective in tax management, consider the case of two neighbors, each with a dependent spouse and two children under age 18, who had incomes of $60,000 and $30,000 respectively in 1982. The farmer with income of $60,000 paid approximately $17,300 in taxes, leaving him with $42,700. The other farmer with income of $30,000 paid approximately $5,500 in taxes, leaving him with $24,500. The farmer with the income of $30,000 that year said to his neighbor, "Well, I'm sure not going to fall into the trap of paying all the tax that you had to pay." If we stop and look at each farmer's position, who is really better off? The neighbor who added $42,700 to his bank account, or the neighbor who added $24,500 to his bank account?

By looking at the after-tax financial effects of production, marketing and tax planning alternatives, you can direct the farm business towards achieving both personal and business goals.

Tax planning is generally concerned with making a choice of one or more legitimate alternatives which leads to creating the least amount of tax. Tax planning falls into one of the following classes:

- deferral of tax
- saving of tax.

The deferral of tax concerns timing of the payment of the tax liability and may not necessarily reduce the overall taxes paid. Such strategies as registered retirement savings plans and rollovers serve to defer taxes. Generally speaking, the practice of deferring taxes does not usually upset tax officials because eventually Revenue Canada will collect the tax revenue otherwise due. A deferral of tax may, given consistent levels of inflation, lead to real savings if the future tax liability is to be paid using dollars which are not worth as much as today's dollars.

The saving of tax serves to reduce the overall amount of taxes actually paid. Splitting income between husband and wife or using various business arrangements can serve in reducing the total tax bill. In comparison with tax deferral, tax savings will usually attract closer scrutiny by tax officials.

Tax planning should be a year-round activity, and must always be balanced with good sound business judgment as well as personal considerations. Effective tax planning requires:

- personal financial goals
- up-to-date records and financial information
- flexible resources
- reliable long range projection of size and source of income.

Other factors to consider include the relevant tax laws, bank interest rates, and inflation rates. The prime objective in tax planning should be to ensure

---

[1] *E.J. Benson, Budget Speech while Minister of Finance, Member of Parliament for Kingston and the Islands, in the House of Commons, Friday, June 18, 1971.*

that taxable income from any transaction either occurs or can be reported in the year it will be most lightly taxed.

When planning your affairs, it is important to keep in mind that what is advantageous for someone else may not necessarily be good in your situation. Keeping good records can tell you what your specific situation is and can be used to reveal which tax alternatives are best for guiding your farm business towards economic and personal goals.

This publication discusses the various tax strategy alternatives available for farmers. By having a basic understanding of the tax rules in relation to the farm business, you should be able to ask the right questions when considering alternatives. Should additional assistance be required you should contact your accountant, lawyer or tax advisor who is up-to-date with the tax laws.

THE INCOME TAX SYSTEM

The federal tax system in Canada, for individuals, is based on a progressive rate structure. This means that the higher an individual's taxable income, the higher the rate of tax on the last dollar of taxable income. To illustrate this concept, consider again the case of the two neighbors, one with an income of $60,000 and the other with $30,000. The last dollar earned by the farmer with the $60,000 income was subjected to federal tax at the rate of 30% whereas the last dollar earned by the other farmer was taxed at a federal rate of 25%. Since the provincial tax is based on a percentage of the federal tax, the individual's marginal tax rate, that is, the combined rate of federal and provincial tax on the next earned dollar, can be expressed as a percentage. For 1982, the first farmer's marginal tax rate was 41.6% (30% + 38.5% of 30%), which means that on the last dollar of income earned, 42 of tax was paid. The appendix contains a chart of the federal marginal tax rates as well as the tax rates for each of the provinces for 1983 and 1984.

Given the progressive rate structure of the income tax system, the total tax paid by two individuals "sharing" a given level of taxable income will be less than the tax paid by one individual on the same level of taxable income. This is the basic premise behind the technique known as "income splitting". The idea is to "split" income which would be taxed at a high marginal rate to a **spouse or child,** where it would be taxed at a lower marginal rate. This technique was made easier by the repeal, effective after 1979, of certain provisions which prevented an individual from claiming, as a business expense, remuneration paid to a spouse who was an employee. It is now possible for a farmer to pay a spouse a salary where the spouse is involved in the operation of the farm.

Paying a child a salary may produce greater tax benefits for the family than paying a spouse. However, the following example illustrates the tax savings possible where this technique is used when paying a salary to a spouse:

Consider a farm operation which generates an income of $75,000 in 1983. Both the farmer and spouse are engaged in the operation of the farm, and there is no off-farm income. In the first case, the farmer reports all of the income and claims the spouse as a dependant. In the second case, the farmer's spouse is paid a salary of $20,000. For simplicity Canada Pension Plan contributions have been ignored. The tax position in each case will be:

ADVANTAGE OF PAYING A SALARY TO A SPOUSE

	Without Salary to Spouse			With Salary to Spouse		
	Farmer	Spouse	Total	Farmer	Spouse	Total
Farm Income	$75,000	–	**$75,000**	$55,000	$ 0	**$55,000**
Employment Income	–	–	**–**	–	20,000	**20,000**
Employment Expense Deduction	–	–	**–**	–	(500)	**(500)**
Net Income	75,000	–	**75,000**	55,000	19,500	**74,500**
Personal Exemptions	7,170	–	**7,170**	3,870	3,870	**7,740**
Taxable Income	$67,830	–	**$67,830**	$51,130	$15,630	**$66,760**
Basic Federal Tax	$17,851	–	**$17,851**	$12,391	$ 2,749	**$15,140**
Federal Tax Reduction	(400)	–	**(400)**	(200)	(200)	**(400)**
Net Federal Tax	17,451	–	**17,451**	12,191	2,549	**14,740**
Provincial Tax (Alberta)	6,873	–	**6,873**	4,771	1,058	**5,829**
Total Tax	$24,324	–	**$24,324**	$16,962	$3,607	**$20,569**

The net tax savings as a result of income splitting is $3,755.

Revenue Canada's position on remuneration to a spouse or a child is that the following conditions must be present before such remuneration will be deductible:

- the salary or wages must actually be paid to the individual
- the amount of remuneration must be **reasonable in light of the services provided by** the individual in the operation of the business
- it would have been necessary to obtain outside help to perform the tasks carried out by the individual.

FARMING – AS THE TAX MAN SEES IT

When is a farm a farm? As unusual as this question may seem, it is a matter that must be resolved to ensure that our federal and provincial tax laws do not operate in an unforeseen manner. The response to this question is of great importance where, for example, the owner of a farm dies or transfers property to his child by way of a gift. At that time, persons who have been in the business of farming and own a family farm may be entitled to receive beneficial income tax treatment. It could mean the difference between being forced to dispose of the farm assets to satisfy an income tax obligation or having the transition of farm ownership proceed without the incidence of income tax at the time of the transfer. The amount of taxes payable will depend on whether or not the facts in each case fit the definitions of farming as they are outlined in the law.

Although the Income Tax Act does not specifically define farming, it does include the following activities under the definition of farming:

- tillage of the soil
- livestock raising or exhibiting
- maintaining of horses for racing
- raising of poultry
- fur farming
- dairy farming
- fruit growing
- keeping of bees.

In addition to these activities which are specifically mentioned in the law, the following operations would, normally, also qualify:

- raising Christmas trees
- nurseries and greenhouses
- running a wild game reserve
- raising race horses for resale
- certain feedlot operations

- operating a chick hatchery.

There are undoubtedly other farming activities which could qualify.

The following types of operations, although they may involve the feeding of livestock, are not considered to be farming operations:

- acting as an agent or broker for the sale of livestock
- buying livestock for resale as quickly as a favorable opportunity presents itself, where this activity is conducted as the main business of the operation
- assembling livestock (where the animals are held for less than three months).

Also, farming does not include trapping, or employment under another person engaged in the business of farming.

As you can see, the definition of farming in the federal Income Tax Act is very broad in scope. It includes numerous activities to which an average person would apply the word "farming". This definition serves to determine what a specific operation is, for the purpose of the Income Tax Act. It does not automatically determine whether a farming operation is a business. To be in the business of farming, the person must be carrying on a particular farming operation with a reasonable expectation that he will earn a profit. This determination becomes very important when the deductibility of losses of a farming operation are reviewed (page 33).

The above is a short summary of the various definitions of farming for income tax purposes. With the complexity and numerous alterations to the Income Tax Act it is difficult to determine how some tax management strategies will apply to a farm business. As a result it is recommended a farmer consult his tax advisor for current information and interpretations.

METHODS OF REPORTING INCOME

All businesses in Canada are required to report their income for tax purposes on an annual basis. Farmers and ranchers are fortunate in that they can determine their income using either the cash or accrual methods. Although most other businesses are required to file on the accrual basis, the majority of farmers file on the cash basis because of the flexibility and tax deferral opportunities offered by the method.

ACCRUAL METHOD

Under this method, income is reported in the year it is earned, regardless of when payment is received, and expenses are deductible in the year in which they are incurred, whether paid or not. As well, changes in current inventory items such as livestock, crops and feeds are included in determining gross income on the accrual basis.

The following example illustrates how income is determined under the accrual method.

Consider a cattle feeding enterprise on a mixed farm with 200 head of cattle in inventory. 205 calves at 440 pounds each are purchased. In the fall, 195 finished cattle are sold at 1050 pounds live weight each. During the year's operation, 12 cattle die, leaving 198 head at year end.

CALCULATION OF INCOME ON ACCRUAL BASIS

Farmer's Contribution		Resulting Yield	
Opening Inventory 200 head $70 cwt x 1100 cwt	$ 77,000	Sales 195 head $75 cwt x 2048 cwt	$153,600
Purchases 205 head $63 cwt x 902 cwt	$ 56,826	Closing Inventory 198 head $72 cwt x 1089 cwt	$ 78,408
Subtotal	$133,826		$232,008

Gross income is the resulting yield less the farmer's contribution during the year.

$232,008 – $133,826 = $98,182

The value of livestock production ($98,182) is gross income calculated on the accrual basis. Under this system, any change upwards or downwards in value of inventory will affect the level of income for tax purposes. The calculation of income by the accrual method, in addition to being an acceptable computation for tax purposes, is a truer reflection of the actual physical (weight gain in the above example) and financial productivity of the enterprise than the cash basis ($153,600 – $56,826 = $96,774).

During years when a business is growing and there are increasing inventories, the accrual method will report the value of the year's increase in income. This method of reporting income keeps income taxes current, but reduces the cash available for investment back into the farm business in expansion years. It might be noted that one minor advantage of the accrual method is the three percent (3%) inventory allowance. This inventory allowance, which is not added back to profit when inventory is sold, became effective in 1977 and was the federal government's effort to offset the effects of inflation on inventory values.

CASH METHOD

The cash method is the most common way of computing farm income as it is basically very simple. Those amounts actually **received** in the year, other than capital items, are included in income and deductions are claimed for those expenses which were actually **paid** for in the year, again, other than for capital items. No accounting has to be made for inventories or accounts receivable, but neither can a deduction be taken for any unpaid bills (accounts payable) at the end of the fiscal year.

Generally speaking, for a young person starting out farming, or where a farmer is building up an existing business, it would be advantageous to use the cash method because:

- the increasing value of inventory is not taxed – the saved taxes are then available to finance future operating and expansion costs
- high and low income years can be block averaged every five years (see page 21)
- during non-averaging years, any annual losses can be carried back three years and forward ten years
- livestock farmers can utilize the Livestock Inventory Provision (sometimes referred to as partial accrual) to further even out income (see page 23) and
- on disposition of a specific segment of the farming operation, or the whole farm business, with a resulting increase in income in one year, the forward averaging provisions contained in the Income Tax Act can be used to smooth out the incidence of income tax on the gain (see page 22).

Although these points have been discussed in the context of a cash basis farmer, certain of them would also apply to a farmer using the accrual method.

According to the Income Tax Act only taxpayers who have income from a farming or fishing business can use the cash method. This includes individuals, corporations, partnerships, and trusts which are in the business of farming. Also, by administrative practice, certain other persons who carry on business but do not have any inventory, work-in-progress or accounts receivable of any kind may also be able to use the cash method. It should be pointed out that farming does not include such things as processing operations carried out in connection with a farming business or the receipt of a crop share under a sharecropping arrangement. Accordingly, income from these types of operations must be reported using the accrual method.

Once you start with this method of income reporting, you must continue to use it each succeeding year. If, at any time, you wish to change from the cash basis to the accrual basis, you must obtain permission from Revenue Canada. If, however, you are using the accrual method and wish to change to the cash method, you may do so without permission of Revenue Canada.

CONSIDERATION IN CHANGING YOUR FISCAL YEAR END

An individual who is not self employed, is required to file an income tax return on income earned in the calendar year. When tax is payable, the tax return must be filed by April 30 of the following year. If no tax is payable, a return need only be filed if requested by the tax department.

In the first year of business, a sole proprietorship, partnership or corporation may choose a fiscal year which is different from the calendar year. In later years, the fiscal year may be changed after obtaining approval from Revenue Canada. By using a fiscal year other than the calendar year, the "business" income would then be reported in the calendar year in which the fiscal period of the business ended.

A noncalendar fiscal year can be advantageous in many cases from the point of view of tax deferral. Different types of operations will have different cycles on an annual basis as far as expenses and revenues are concerned. If a cash basis farmer were to choose a fiscal year end some time after most of the expenses have been paid but before revenues are received, the farmer will essentially be able to

defer payment of tax on the revenues for one year. It should be remembered, however, that financial planning and management may be affected by a fiscal year other than a calendar year.

A farmer should be aware that if he/she ceases the farming operation and has already had a fiscal year end in that calendar year, he/she will be considered to have had a short fiscal year which lasted from the end of the previous fiscal year to the point of ceasing operations. In this situation, the farmer could have two fiscal year ends in the same calendar year. To illustrate this, assume a farmer had a fiscal year that ended on July 31, 1983. Further assume that the farmer decided to cease farming on October 31, 1983. The farmer would then have two fiscal years ending in 1983, one ending on July 31 and one ending on October 31, and would be required to report the income from both fiscal years in 1983. There is however, a relieving provision in this situation which would allow the farmer to **elect** to have the second fiscal year extend to the normal fiscal year end. In the example above, the second fiscal year end would be considered to run from August 1, 1983 to July 31, 1984, and the income from that fiscal year would be reported in 1984 instead of 1983.

BASIC FILING INFORMATION

The following steps may be used as a guide to filing a tax return.

STEP 1: Compile Farm Income and Expense Statement – Form T2042 in the Farmer's Income Tax Guide or a similar statement.

Be sure to include:

- wages paid to children or a spouse
- capital cost allowance
- livestock inventory amount necessary
- 25% of the cost of repairs to the house and up to 2/3 of the car expenses
- deduction allowance on quotas in cumulative eligible capital account
- income from woodlots if you cut and sell it yourself
- applicable government grants and subsidies as income
- surface rentals from petroleum and natural gas leases
- income deferred in previous year with deferred cash purchase tickets for grain
- the full amount of taxable patronage dividends as income except for those received for personal goods and services
- the costs of bringing in public utilities if the utility company retains ownership of the capital assets (i.e. the gas line)
- land improvements such as clearing, levelling or laying the drainage
- depletion allowance down to original costs on woodlots, sand and gravel pits if the profits are being included in income.

STEP 2: Calculate Personal Exemptions

- basic deduction
- child exemption
- Canada Pension Plan contributions
- medical, etc.

STEP 3: Calculate Taxable Income and Tax Payable

After allowable deductions have been subtracted from income, the balance will be Taxable Income.

Strategies If Taxable Income Is Positive

- Review the level of capital cost allowance claimed – depending on your tax rates (high or low?) and also on future plans, you may want to adjust the level accordingly.
- Review non-capital losses from previous years and ensure that all losses of other years have been claimed to the extent possible. This will be further dealt with in the section dealing with losses. NOTE: You cannot create a loss in the present year when claiming losses of other years.
- Consider if this may be the best year to block average.
- Consider forward averaging.

Strategies If Taxable Income Is Negative

- Review the livestock inventory provision (page 23). This may be used to:
  - pick up personal exemptions
  - claim maximum capital cost allowance
  - take advantage of roughly the first $2,000 of taxable income which does not bear any tax
  - catch up previous losses
  - increase the benefit of a five year block average
  - "borrow" income from next year in excess of what will be realized this year
- Reduce the amount of capital cost allowance claimed for present year.
- Investigate the benefit of applying losses back three years and forward ten.
- Consider the benefits of block averaging

Once the appropriate level of taxable income has been decided, the tables provided by Revenue Canada can be used to determine the amount of taxes payable. An individual whose chief source of income is farming is required to make an installment on account of his tax liability by December 31 of each year with the balance to be paid by April 30 of the following year. Revenue Canada has forms available to assist in the calculation of the amount of the installment payment.

SIMPLIFIED INDIVIDUAL TAX RETURN

FARM	PERSONAL AND OFF-FARM
Income (Timing of Fiscal Year) (Cash vs Accrual)	+ Net Employment Earnings + Pension and Annuity Income
– Expenses	+ Registered Retirement Income Fund + Investment Income
= Margin	+ Net Income from Off-Farm Self-Employment
– CCA (Parts XI and XVII)	+/- 1/2 Capital Gains or Losses + Other (Rental, UIC, Family Allowance)
= Net Income from Farming	= Off-Farm Income

= TOTAL INCOME

LESS:
- Premiums (UIC, CPP, or QPP)
- Child Care Expenses
- Registered Retirement Savings Plan Contributions
- Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan Contributions
- Other (Union/Professional Dues, Tuition)

= NET INCOME

LESS:
- Personal Exemptions
- Medical Expenses and Charitable Donations
- Interest and Dividend Income Deduction ($1000)
- Losses from Other Years (Farm Losses, Restricted Farm Losses, Non-Capital Losses, Net Capital Losses)

= TAXABLE INCOME

Further Strategy Areas Influencing Taxable Income:
- 5 Year Block Average
- Forward Averaging
- Livestock Inventory Provisions
- Investment Tax Credit
- Basic Herd
- Deferred Initial Grain Payment
- Partnership
- Incorporation (Company and Co-op)
- Other Deferments (Rollovers)

CAPITAL COST ALLOWANCE

The cost of fixed assets such as machinery, equipment, vehicles and buildings cannot be deducted as an expense in one taxation year. Instead, the expenditures are considered to be of a "capital" nature, and, therefore the cost must be spread over a period of years by taking a deduction based on the cost of the assets. The distribution of the cost of a fixed asset over its estimated useful life in a systematic manner is termed "depreciation". The term "capital cost allowance" is a tax term referring to the amount which Revenue Canada allows a farmer to deduct as depreciation in computing his net farm income.

Under the pre-1972 income tax system, farmers could choose between two different methods for calculating capital cost allowance:

- the straight-line (Part XVII) method
- the declining balance (Part XI) method.

The *straight-line* method allows an equal amount of capital cost allowance to be claimed each year. The Income Tax Act has established a percentage rate which is multiplied by the original cost of the asset to obtain the amount claimed each year. Under the present law, the straight-line method is being phased out. No capital asset purchases after December 31, 1971 may be written off on this basis. However, assets which were owned on December 31, 1971 may be handled on the straight-line basis as long as the farmer remains in the business of farming and provided they have never been written off on the declining balance basis. He may, however, at any time, transfer the undepreciated cost of a straight-line asset into a prescribed asset class under the declining balance basis, but once this decision is made, it is irreversible. As in the elimination of basic herds, to be discussed later, the phasing out of straight-line capital cost allowance will be a gradual process which will take a number of years to accomplish.

Using the *declining balance* method, the capital cost allowance is equal to the book value of the asset multiplied by the percentage rate established in the Income Tax Act. Because the book value is reduced each year, the amount of capital cost allowance claimed each year is smaller than that of the previous year. When using the declining balance method, similar assets are grouped into classes and capital cost allowance is based on the cost of all assets in the class less amounts allowed in previous years as the capital cost allowance on these assets.

Recent changes to the Income Tax Act have introduced a half-year concept to the capital cost allowance system. In the year that a depreciable asset is purchased, the CCA that can be claimed on that asset will be limited to one-half the regular CCA. This half-year rule applies to net additions in a year so that, where a farmer disposes of equipment, the restricted CCA claim will only apply to the cost of assets acquired less disposal proceeds of assets disposed. With this change in the rules, if a farmer is planning on acquiring equipment, it is best to acquire it before the end of a fiscal year instead of early in the next fiscal year. By accelerating the date of purchase, the farmer will be able to claim CCA on the asset that much sooner. To illustrate this, consider the case of a farmer who is planning to acquire a used self-propelled combine for $125,000 and has a fiscal year end of December 31, 1983. If the farmer acquires the combine before December 31 he/she would be able to claim CCA of $18,750 in 1983 and $31,875 in 1984. If he acquires the combine in January 1984, he/she would not be able to claim anything in 1983 and $18,750 in 1984. By purchasing the combine in 1983, the farmer has accelerated the claiming of CCA. Where a farmer is going to dispose of a piece of equipment the reverse would apply; defer the sale until after a fiscal year end.

Revenue Canada has also changed its assessing practice concerning manufacturer's rebates. Where an individual receives a rebate directly from a third party manufacturer on the purchase of an asset from an independent distributor, the capital cost of the asset is no longer required to be reduced. This means that in claiming CCA and the investment tax credit, the base will be considered to be the gross cost of the asset and not net of any rebate. In addition, this rebate is not considered to be income. In effect, it becomes a "nothing" for tax purposes. This change in policy came about as a result of a tax case that Revenue Canada lost, and it is expected that this problem will probably be resolved by an amendment to the Income Tax Act.

The mechanical rules for the two methods are familiar to most farmers and are adequately explained in the *Farmer's Income Tax Guide*, so it is not necessary to repeat them in detail here. It is appropriate, however, to provide a summary of some of the major similarities and differences in the two systems:

FLEXIBILITY IN THE AMOUNT OF CCA CLAIMED

Under either system a farmer can choose to make a CCA claim of any amount up to the maximum percentage allowed by the class (percentage rates vary from 1% to 100% depending on the asset). By using the maximum rate in a year of high income and a lower rate in a year of low income, a farmer can use capital cost allowance to his best advantage. A maximum capital cost allowance claim in each year may not always be the best tax management strategy.

Additionally, an advantage could be obtained by varying the capital cost allowance claimed each year by adjusting the order in which such allowance is claimed. Consider claiming depreciation on assets in the following order: 1) straight-line assets, 2) class 6 assets, 3) class 8 assets, and 4) class 10 assets. The basic reasoning of this is that if straight-line assets, which are not subject to recapture when sold, are not depreciated fully by the time they are sold, then the depreciation is lost. In comparing the different classes of declining balance assets, class 6 (10%) has a lower maximum yearly rate than class 10 (30%). It will take longer to write off the classes with the lower rates. Therefore, the balance in a higher rate class (e.g. class 10) can be preserved by not taking the maximum rate in a low income year, and a larger CCA claim will be available in a high income year.

The following example illustrates how this would work: Assume two classes of depreciable assets with the following undepreciated cost: Class 6 (10%) = $100,000, Class 10 (30%) = $100,000.

		SITUATION A			SITUATION B	
YEAR		CLASS	CLAIMED		CLAIMED	
1	Net Income before CCA			$ 10,000		$ 10,000
	Less CCA claimed	6	10%	10,000	nil	–
		10	nil		10%	10,000
	Net Farm Income			nil		nil
2	Undepreciated Capital Cost at Beginning of year		6 (10%):	$ 90,000	$100,000	
			10 (30%):	$100,000	$ 90,000	
	Net Income before CCA			$ 10,000		$ 10,000
	Less CCA claimed	6	10%	9,000	nil	–
		10	1%	1,000	11.11%	10,000
	Net Farm Income			nil		nil
3	Undepreciated Capital Cost at beginning of year		6 (10%):	$ 81,000	$100,000	
			10 (30%):	$ 99,000	$ 80,000	
	Net Income before CCA			$ 60,000		$ 60,000
	Less CCA claimed	6	10%	8,100	10%	10,000
		10	30%	29,700	30%	24,000
	Net Farm Income			$ 22,200		$ 26,000

The result of depreciating the lower rate class first, and maintaining a larger undepreciated capital cost in the higher rate class, is that more CCA is available for high income years. Such a strategy would give more flexibility, but should be considered in terms of the particular situation.

A strategy of varying the capital cost allowance claim each year may be beneficial to farmers holding their depreciable assets for a greater number of years by stretching the number of years that capital cost allowance may be claimed before the asset is written off. When considering a claim of less than the maximum amount, the impact of block averaging should be examined.

HIGHER INITIAL WRITE-OFFS FOR DECLINING BALANCE METHOD

The maximum write-off rates for assets depreciated under the declining balance method are approximately twice as high as for assets depreciated under the straight-line method (Example: trucks are 15% on straight-line and 30% on declining balance). This means that, in the initial years, the declining balance basis will produce higher write-offs, but, in the later years, the write-offs will be lower than those under the straight-line method.

DIFFERING RULES IN THE YEAR OF SALE

When a straight-line asset is sold, capital cost allowance is claimed for the number of months it was owned. However, when a declining balance asset is sold, the proceeds simply reduce the balance in the class and the base on which further claims are taken.

RECAPTURE AND TERMINAL LOSS OF CAPITAL COST ALLOWANCE

Declining Balance Assets: If a depreciable asset is sold or traded in for proceeds greater than the value recorded for tax purposes (but less than the asset's original cost), the difference is called "recaptured capital cost allowance". Under the declining balance method, this amount is taxable, but usually only has the effect of reducing the tax base of assets in that class for the year's capital cost allowance calculation. As a result, the capital cost allowance deduction available for the year on that class of assets as a whole will be lower.

A terminal loss is just the opposite of recapture. It results when all declining balance assets in a class are sold for proceeds less than the undepreciated values of the assets of that class. A terminal loss is fully deductible from income in the year it arose.

Consider the following example:

	SITUATION 1	SITUATION 2
Capital cost of asset	$ 7,500	$ 7,500
Capital cost of asset	$ 7,500	$ 7,500
Proceeds of disposition	2,300	2,300
Undepreciated capital cost of assets in class	6,000	2,000
CALCULATIONS		
Undepreciated capital cost of assets in class	$ 6,000	$ 2,000
LESS: Proceeds of disposition	2,300	2,300
Revised undepreciated capital cost of assets remaining in class	$ 3,700	$ (300)

Situation 1: If we assume there is one remaining asset in this class and that we sell it for $2,300, we see that an undepreciated balance of $3,700 ($6,000 – $2,300) remains. This sum is a terminal loss and is deductible in computing net income for the year.

Situation 2: If this negative balance of $300.00 remains at the end of the year, it must be added to net income for the year as **recaptured capital cost** allowance.

Straight-line Assets: On disposal of assets on the straight-line method, any recaptured capital cost allowance **will not be included in income**, nor can a terminal loss be claimed.

CAPITAL GAINS AND CAPITAL LOSSES

Under either system a capital gain on depreciable property could occur when sale proceeds received for an asset exceed the original cost of that asset. As a general rule, only the amount of gain which arises after December 31, 1971, and in excess of fair market value at that date, will result in a capital gain. A capital loss, however, will never arise from the disposal of depreciable property as proceeds received from the disposal of an asset which are less than the original cost of the asset are simply applied against the undepreciated balance of the CCA pool.

TRANSFER OF DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY TO A SPOUSE

Declining balance assets transferred to a spouse during the farmer's lifetime or on his death will generally move to his spouse at their undepreciated capital cost, and any recapture of capital cost allowance or capital gain will be postponed until sale of the assets by the spouse or until the spouse's death. "Straight-line" assets transferred to a spouse, during a farmer's lifetime or on his death, will generally pass at their tax values ("adjusted cost base") and no capital gain, if any, will arise until the sale of the asset or until the spouse's death.

A recent amendment to the Income Tax Act now provides that if elected, a transfer of property to a spouse could occur at the fair market value of the property. This provision would be useful in limited circumstances.

TRANSFER OF DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY TO A CHILD UNDER THE FARM ROLLOVER PROVISIONS

Under the special "farm rollover" provisions which are discussed later, declining balance assets can be transferred at the undepreciated capital cost of the assets. Recapture and capital gain is therefore deferred until such time as the property is sold by the child. Straight-line assets, however, can only be transferred to a child at their **fair market value**. No recapture results, of course, but it is possible that there could be a taxable capital gain if the proceeds of the sale are greater than the V-day value of the assets. Once a child acquires the depreciable property, he must take capital cost allowance on the declining balance method.

The above comparisons show some of the similarities and differences between the two methods of calculating capital cost allowance. Although there are factors of lesser importance to consider, these should be a good guide in planning. As a general rule, most farmers continue with the straight-line method wherever they can, and use the declining balance method only for those assets which they have acquired after 1971. This may require a little extra record keeping, but it could prove to be the most beneficial choice for the farmer. If the decision to take the simpler way and switch all assets over to declining balance is made, the *Farmer's Income Tax Guide* has a good outline of the procedures to follow in making this change on the tax return. The ultimate measure of benefit between these two methods will, however depend upon each farmer and his circumstances.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Income Tax Act allows a taxpayer, whether an individual, a corporation, or a trust, to deduct from federal income tax payable an amount in respect of his investment tax credit at the end of the year.

The investment tax credit applies to many items included in a farmer's capital cost allowance schedule and purchased after June 23, 1975.

The credit covers new buildings, farm equipment and machinery used in the farm business. New farm trucks over 26,000 pounds gross vehicle weight used to haul outside your local are also eligible for the investment tax credit. The tax credit does not apply, however, to cars, milk quotas, purchases of used machinery, the cost of tile drainage, or a new farm home.

For investment tax credits earned before April 19, 1983, the amount of tax credit deductible is limited to the lesser of:

- the investment tax credit balance at the end of the year
- the federal tax payable
- $15,000 plus one-half of the federal tax payable in excess of $15,000.

The recent federal budget of April 19, 1983 has however liberalized the utilization of investment tax credits considerably. Where investment tax credits are earned after April 19, 1983, the full amount of the investment tax credit available can be applied against any federal tax payable.

A minor limitation to the provision is that the capital cost of the asset for depreciation purposes will be reduced by the amount of the tax credit claimed. In other words, if the investment cost is $20,000 and the tax credit claimed is $1,000, the starting point for capital cost allowance will be $19,000. This requirement to reduce the depreciable base of an asset by the tax credit claimed in respect of that asset could lead to a circular calculation. Where the tax credit is claimed, the base for depreciation will be lower, which will in turn lower the CCA claim, which in turn will result in higher taxable income and higher federal tax liability. Where a farmer is in a position to fully claim any tax credits earned, this should not create a problem. However, if the farmer's taxable income is not high enough to use up the full tax credit, it may be necessary to go through the calculations a number of times to arrive at the best answer. Where a farmer does not claim his full tax credit in the year an investment is made, he is only required to reduce the base for calculating CCA by the amount actually claimed in the year. Any unclaimed balance may be carried over to other years. When this carryover amount is claimed, the amount claimed is deducted from the undepreciated capital cost of the tax class relevant to the asset acquired.

Under present law, any unused investment tax credit can be carried forward for up to five (5) years. The recent federal budget has substantially increased the carryover period by making it possible to carry any unused tax credit earned after April 19, 1983 back three (3) taxation years and forward seven (7) taxation years. This increased carryover period is to be phased in, with the result that the carryback for the 1983 taxation year will be limited to two years.

When the investment tax credit was introduced in 1975, the basic rate was 5%. Since that time, there have been a number of changes to the rate and to the type of equipment that qualifies. The basic rate is now 7% with increased rates for certain low-growth areas of the country. Detailed maps highlighting the boundaries of the various investment tax credit regions are contained in the Revenue Canada Information Circular-IC 78-4R2.

The following example illustrates how the investment tax credit works:

Assume: – Farmer purchases an new tractor for $30,000 (Class 10) in 1983
– Taxable income is $27,000 (before CCA is claimed for new tractor)

The capital cost allowance on the purchase price of the tractor is:

$30,000 x.30 x.50 = $4,500

The investment tax credit (7%) will be:

$30,000 x.07 = $2,100

The adjusted capital cost for CCA purposes when using the tax credit:

Purchase Price	$30,000
Less: Tax Credit	2,100
Adjusted Cost For CCA Purposes	$27,900

CCA on Adjusted Cost:
$27,900 x.30 x.50 = $4,185

The net position after tax in each case will be:

WITHOUT TAX CREDIT		USING TAX CREDIT	
Taxable Income	$ 27,000	Taxable Income	$ 27,000
CCA on Tractor	4,500	CCA on Tractor	4,185
Net Taxable Income	22,500	Net Taxable Income	22,815
Basic Federal Tax	4,329	Basic Federal Tax	4,407
General Tax Reduction	(400)	General Tax Reduction	(400)
Federal Tax Payable	3,929	Federal Tax Payable	4,007
Investment Tax Credit	–	Investment Tax Credit	(2,100)
Net Federal Tax	3,929	Net Federal Tax	1,907
Provincial Tax	1,667	Provincial Tax	1,697
Total Tax	$ 5,596	Total Tax	$ 3,604

The net tax savings as a result of the investment tax credit is $1,992.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT IN A FARM PARTNERSHIP

In a farm partnership, any investment tax credit for the year is divided among the members of the partnership according to each member's partnership interest. This allocation of the tax credit to individual partners should be done at the end of each fiscal year. The capital cost of each asset, on which the tax credit is being distributed, must also be reduced for capital cost allowance purposes by the amount of the tax credit allocated to the partners for that asset.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT IN A CORPORATION

As long as the qualifying assets were purchased by the farm corporation, the calculation of the tax credit in determining the corporation's taxes is similar to that for an individual. The April 1983 budget introduced certain provisions that, in effect, will allow a corporation to flow out to a shareholder a portion of the investment tax credit balance which the corporation cannot use. If additional information is required concerning this procedure, a tax advisor should be consulted.

TAX TREATMENT OF BASIC HERDS AND OTHER FARMING INVENTORIES

This chapter will discuss briefly how the federal income tax laws deal with livestock inventories, crop inventories, and other inventory items.

LIVESTOCK INVENTORIES

These assets will be dealt with under two separate headings: *basic herds* and the *constant unit* election. As time goes on, and the tax system matures, tax problems involving basic herds will gradually disappear and questions regarding the other system of accounting for livestock will replace them. However, basic herds will be around for some time yet, so it is important to understand the rules.

Basic Herds

This term was used under the pre-1972 tax system and applied to certain specified groups of animals (cattle, horses, sheep or swine) owned by a farmer. Once a basic herd of a class of animals was established for income tax purposes, the cost of additions to the basic herd was not deductible, and the proceeds from reductions of the basic herd were not taxable. In other words, the herd was recognized as a capital asset in somewhat the same way that plant and equipment are capital assets to a manufacturing business. It is interesting to note that the basic herd concept was not authorized by law under the pre-1972 tax system, but was strictly the result of the practice of the tax authorities. In the new tax system however, while basic herds are now defined, they are also being eliminated with the passage of time. No new basic herds can be established, nor can existing ones be increased. Special transitional rules have been established to phase out those basic herds which have been allowed to carry over into the new system.

Simply stated, the transitional rules provide two different ways in which this phase-out of existing basic herds will be accomplished: the *mandatory* reduction and the *optional* reduction.

The Mandatory Reduction

As a general rule, if a herd of animals at the end of a taxation year is less than the approved basic herd number, the farmer's approved basic herd must be reduced to the lower figure. The farmer must then take a deduction from his income representing the amount of this reduction which has occurred in his herd. The formula for the deduction is:

Deduction from income	=	Number of animals by which basic herd was reduced	×	Average of the fair market value of all the animals in that class at December 31, 1971

If a farmer with a basic herd wishes to ensure that he does not fall under this mandatory reduction in his basic herd, he/she should ensure that, at the end of the year, the number of animals in that class is not less than the number of animals in his/her basic herd for that class of animal. If this is done each year, the basic herd can be continued indefinitely in the new tax system.

Optional Reduction

If a farmer does not have a decrease in his herd which brings the mandatory reduction into effect, he/she still has the choice of using the optional reduction. These rules allow a farmer to write off each year, for tax purposes, a maximum of one-tenth of the December 31, 1971 fair market value of his/her basic herd. In fact, the amount of the deduction which will be allowable may be less than one-tenth since it cannot exceed the least of the following three criteria:

- the number of animals of the class disposed of in the year
- 10% of the basic herd at December 31, 1971
- the number of animals in the "basic herd" at the end of the preceding year.

Farmers should also note that, where a write-off of 10% of the basic herd is available, **it does not have to be taken in full.** Any amount less than 10% could be taken for the year. A farmer might need to take only a 5% write-off, for example, to reduce his/her taxable income to nil. Or, in a year of relatively low income, he/she might prefer not to take any write-off and save the deduction until future years when profits are higher.

At the time of tax reform, Revenue Canada prepared an excellent summary of the basic herd rules, together with illustrative examples, in a booklet entitled, *Basic Herds.* Every farmer who accounts for any of his/her livestock on this basis should have a copy of this publication to guide him as to the tax treatment of his/her purchases and sales.

V-Day Values

If the December 31, 1971 market value for your basic herd has not yet been established, it should be done as soon as possible. As in the case of other V-Day valuations, the higher the value assigned to the animals, the greater the tax advantage when the animals are disposed of, but the values must be reasonable and supportable to be accepted by the tax authorities.

Basic Herds on Death or Cessation of Business

If, at the time of a farmer's death, his/her livestock herd had a fair market value of $150,000, and the value of his/her basic herd at December 31, 1971 (which had not yet been expensed for tax purposes) was $80,000. In the final income tax return of the farmer, $150,000 must be shown as income, but this will be partially offset by the deduction of $80,000 as the value of his basic herd. Legal representatives who look after the deceased farmer's affairs should be aware that a **separate tax return** can be filed to report this type of income (Rights or Things – see page 42). A second set of personal exemptions can also then be claimed on this return.

As an alternative, the legal representative may, within certain time limits, transfer the ownership of the basic herd to the spouse or children of the farmer who are beneficiaries of his estate. If this is done, the cost to the beneficiary for tax purposes will be considered to be an amount equal to the fair market value of the basic herd at December 31, 1971, minus any amounts deducted previously from the basic herd by the deceased. Upon sale, the beneficiary will include only the excess of sale price over the basic herd value transferred. A beneficiary who inherits basic herd animals will not be permitted to carry on with the basic herd concept.

When a farmer goes out of business and sells his/her herd, he will get a full deduction for the basic herd value which has not yet been expensed and the full amount of proceeds from sale must be brought into income with the net difference being subject to tax. The tax on this income can be lessened through the use of forward averagin

Miscellaneous Comments on Basic Herds

There are some additional points that should be made regarding basic herds. The first point, already mentioned but worth emphasizing, is that, even though the basic herd is treated like a **capital** asset, increases in the value of the animals are not treated as capital gains (one-half taxable) but as **ordinary income** (fully taxable). Second, basic herds were available under the pre-1972 tax system not only to "cash" basis farmers but also to farmers who used the accrual method of accounting. This practice has been continued under the present rules, and Rev-

enue Canada's booklet shows how the calculations would be made. Farming corporations, provided they had established their basic herds by the date their 1971 income tax returns had to be filed, are also entitled to use the basic herd rules in the same manner as individual farmers. Farming partnerships, however, would not be entitled to have basic herds, since a partnership entity is technically not a taxpayer.

The Constant Unit Value Election for Farmers Who are not on the Cash Basic

Farmers are entitled to use the accrual method of accounting (under which inventory values must be taken into account) or the "cash" method (under which inventory values can be ignored) in computing income for tax purposes. Although most farmers use the cash method some farmers, for various reasons, choose to use the accrual method of accounting. In a period when the value of livestock is rising it is possible that profits calculated on this basis may be high, purely as a result of the value of a farmer's inventory. It is conceivable that a farmer could show a profit on which tax was payable without having cash with which to pay such taxes since his profit for the year was represented by an unrealized increase in the value of inventory. In recognition of this type of problem, the government has provided a special election for farmers who report income on the accrual basis. This election enables them to report their inventory at values which remain level from one year to the next. The result is that the variations of the livestock inventory values are removed and the farmer's income for tax purposes closely mirrors his cash flow for the year.

The election is available to any person in the business of breeding and raising animals but may not be used with respect to registered animals, feedlot operations or animals bought for resale. The election is made by filing special form T2034 with the income tax return for the year in which the constant unit value is adopted.

Crops and Other Inventories

As with livestock, inventories of crops or other items can be ignored by "cash" basis farmers but must be accounted for by "accrual" method farmers. These inventory items would include hay, feed pellets, seed, fertilizer, fencing wire and posts, and other supplies of any kind. The inventory valuation methods which are acceptable under income tax rules entail valuing:

- the entire inventory at cost
- the entire inventory at fair market value
- the individual items in inventory at lower of cost or fair market value.

The same principles and tax options available to a farmer's livestock inventory in cessation of business also apply with regard to crop and other inventories.

Deferred Cash Grain Tickets

The use of the "deferred cash grain ticket provides a means by which crop inventories can be sold in one year but not subject to tax until the subsequent year. The use of these tickets is described in the *Farmer's Income Tax Guide*.

> When you deliver grain to a licensed public elevator or process elevator, you may receive a storage ticket, a cash purchase ticket or a deferred cash purchase ticket. If a storage ticket is issued, no sale has taken place and, therefore, you have not received income at that time. If a cash ticket is issued, a sale has taken place and you are considered to have received payment at that time, regardless of when the ticket is presented for payment. If a deferred cash purchase ticket is issued, and the ticket provides for payment at a date that is after the end of the fiscal period in which the grain is delivered for sale, you must report the purchase price stated in the ticket as income in the immediately following fiscal period. This deferral of income is only available in certain circumstances which are explained in Interpretation Bulletin IT-184R entitled "Deferred Cash Purchase Tickets Issued for Grain".

The use of a deferred cash purchase ticket enables a grain farmer to take advantage of the price prevailing at a particular point in time while deferring the income for tax purposes. The rule is only available, however, to grain farmers who use the "cash" method of accounting for their income.

CAPITAL GAINS

The most significant change brought about by Canada's 1971 tax reform was the taxation of capital gains. Virtually every Canadian who owns property was affected by this decision of the policy makers who developed the new Income Tax Act. Canadians have since gradually become accustomed to using the phrase Valuation day or simply V-day as the day on which the measurement of all capital gains subject to tax would begin. Two valuation days were established:

- December 22, 1971, for publicly-traded shares and securities
- December 31, 1971, for all other types of capital property.

Essentially, any gain which has accrued prior to V-day is exempt from tax, but any gain arising after V-day is subject to tax. The same principle applies with regard to the deduction of capital losses. The controversy surrounding the taxation of capital gains resulted in a policy that only **half** of the amount of a capital gain is taxable and only **half** of a capital loss is deductible.

The immediate implications of taxing capital gains are fairly simple. If *capital property* was owned at V-day, or acquired after that date, it is likely that the property will be disposed of for proceeds which are either more or less than V-day value or cost. The resulting capital gains or losses will create a tax cost or tax saving in the year in which the disposition is made.

WHAT IS CAPITAL PROPERTY?

Capital property includes, under normal circumstances, the following common types of assets which a farmer might own:

- farmland and improvements such as drainage and fences
- buildings
- machinery, equipment, vehicles, etc.
- farm homes
- stocks, bonds and other securities
- personal use property such as boats, summer cottages, automobiles and other assets of this nature
- certain items specified as listed personal property: coins, stamps, rare books, jewellery, drawings, paintings or sculptures.

A host of special rules exist with regard to the tax treatment of capital gains and losses on these various kinds of assets. As well as the above list, which is not all-inclusive, a farmer will also have to determine the gain or loss for the following properties:

- basic herds
- milk quotas or other "government rights" or licences of a similar nature.

Studies have indicated that, on the average, Canadian farmers have two-thirds of their assets tied up in farmland alone. The need, therefore, to maintain accurate cost records for all property, including property acquired after valuation day and the V-day valuation of property held at December 31, 1971, is very important.

What is a Disposition of Capital Property?

A *disposition* includes a number of circumstances in addition to the simple sale of property to a third party. A disposition will occur for income tax act purposes, if one of the following events occur:

- property is sold
- property is gifted
- the owner of the property dies
- property is taken unlawfully
- property is expropriated
- property is destroyed and insurance proceeds are received
- property is transferred to a trust, corporation or partnership.

This checklist is not all inclusive, but it covers the more common situations. Farmers have received special consideration with regard to certain dispositions relating to the family farm (see page 26). The existence of these provisions makes the need for a V-day values very important. The effect of these rules is only to **postpone** tax on property, not to exempt it from tax. The longer the deferral, however, the greater the benefit.

VALUATION DAY VALUES

Although there is a tendency to defer determining V-day values until a disposition of the property takes place, **the time to establish these values is now.** In establishing these values, it is important to consider the following factors:

Inflation – Property values have risen since V-day and will probably continue to do so. For some assets, such as real estate, values are changing almost daily. Establishing the value at a particular point in time will become more difficult the longer the valuation is delayed.

Documentation – Documentation which can provide support for asset values at December 31, 1971 is still available, but, with the passage of time, this evidence (such as news articles, advertised prices for similar assets etc.) becomes much more difficult to obtain. Consider, for example, published list prices and trade-in values for farm machinery.

Photographs – These may be used to portray the condition of an asset at or near valuation day. Pictures can be of great assistance in cases where an asset changes over a period of years. An example might be a parcel of , land adjacent to a deep gully in which serious erosion was taking place. The land might have had considerable value at V-day but be virtually useless as farmland at the date of disposition many years later due to the erosion. A photograph taken near V-day could provide excellent support for a relatively higher V-day value.

Information Regarding Neighboring Properties – A record of the selling price of neighboring or similar properties provides a strong guideline for the value of a particular property. It is much easier to compile this information now than many years hence. Comparable sales information may be available from Revenue Canada.

Knowledgeable Persons Who Can Provide Information or Opinions – Although no one knows more about a farm than the farmer himself, if he dies without documenting this, the value of his intimate knowledge of the farm will be lost. Persons with a working knowledge of real property values in a given area at December 31, 1971 also may not be available when a property is ultimately disposed of. Getting a letter of opinion from them now is important, as it may not be possible when the need for it arises.

Getting an Appraisal – The above comments have all related to farmers who wish to establish their V-day values themselves rather than have a formal appraisal done by a professional appraiser. Appraisals are expensive, but are important in cases where the value of a farmer's property is substantial. Farmers with property valued in excess of $100,000, for example, are well advised to get a formal appraisal. This is especially true in areas of urban influence. The accredited appraiser's job is a difficult one, but it will never be any easier than it is now.

Estate Settlement – The handling of a person's estate will be considerably easier if the deceased person has V-day values on hand for all his property. This should be taken as seriously as making a will.

Rollovers of Property to a Spouse or Children

The general concept of the rollover provisions is that the recognition of a capital gain or a recapture of capital cost allowances is deferred. Tax will not be payable until the death of a surviving spouse or until the property ceases to be passed from one generation to the next. It is possible that a family farm could be operated for many succeeding generations before the time finally comes for the tax to be paid. Who will be around in the year 2084 to determine what the property was worth December 31, 1971? **Take steps now to establish pertinent V-day values.**

Determining Valuation Day Values

A farmer can either obtain the services of a professional appraiser to establish this value or he can do it himself. The cost of getting an appraisal could amount to several hundred dollars. It is important to note that such an expenditure is not deductible as a business expense, nor can it be used to reduce the amount of capital gain which will ultimately arise on disposal of the property. Nevertheless, a professional appraisal provides valuable evidence when a taxpayer is defending his V-day value should it be disputed by Revenue Canada.

A Final Note on Valuation of Farm Property

A natural question for a person to ask is, "How are the tax authorities going to know what my farm is worth at V-day?". The answer is two-fold. Revenue Canada maintains a staff of experts in the field of appraisals and business valuation. Additionally, Revenue Canada has compiled detailed information on real estate transactions all across Canada which took place close to V-day. This information is available to assist a tax assessor in determining whether or not the V-day value which a farmer reports is reasonable.

These data have been computerized and made accessible to all who need it. The information assembled is known as the Real Estate Data Bank. Enquiries regarding the Real Estate Data Bank can be directed to your District Taxation office.

It should be emphasized that the Real Estate Data Bank will not contain actual appraisals of properties sold in 1971 or 1972, and will not contain information on any properties other than those sold in those years. The Data Bank will only contain information which may be helpful in establishing the Valuation Day values of properties at some future date.

It should be emphasized that the Data Bank information is no substitute for the information which a taxpayer can gather on his her own property. The bank data will provide only rough guide-posts to values, and both the taxpayer and the Department will be dependent in large measure on the information which the taxpayer himself herself is able to obtain.

Clearly, if a farmer does not do his own V-day valuation and support it with proper documentation, he she may be forced to accept the value which Revenue Canada establishes. Their value may be neither as accurate nor as advantageous as the one which a farmer can determine himself. Remember, if the value is ever questioned, **the onus is on the farmer to substantiate it.**

CALCULATION OF CAPITAL GAINS

As mentioned previously, the general rule is that one-half the amount of a person's total capital gains, less any capital losses, is included in income for tax purposes. The basic system of determining a capital gain on the disposition of property is as follows:

Proceeds of Disposition		$ 20,000
Less: Adjusted Cost Base	$12,000	
Plus: Outlays and Expenses	400	
	$12,400	12,400
Capital Gain		$ 7,600
TAXABLE CAPITAL GAIN (1/2 x $7,600)		$ 3,800

Assuming there are no capital losses, the taxable capital gain of $3,800 would be added to income and taxed at normal rates.

There are two methods which could be used in determining the *adjusted cost base* of property held on December 31, 1971. The first, called the **median rule**, is based upon the original cost or purchase price of the property, the valuation day value of the property, and the proceeds of disposition. The middle of these three values will be used as the adjusted cost base of the property for computing any capital gain or loss. The second method is the **Valuation Day rule**. Under this method, the V-day value is used as the adjusted cost base for determining all capital gains and losses. The valuation day method is not available to corporations; the median rule for capital property owned on December 31, 1971 must be used.

Once an individual has elected to use the Valuation Day value, he/she must continue to use it for all dispositions on capital property owned on December 31, 1971. Similarly, if he/she elects to use the median rule, he/she must continue to use it on dispositions of capital property owned on December 31, 1971. He/she may not switch from one method to another.

The following table will assist in understanding these two options:

	A	B	C	D	E
Original Cost	$10,000	$15,000	$12,000	$13,000	$10,000
Valuation Day Value	13,000	11,000	10,000	12,000	12,000
Proceeds of Disposition	20,000	13,000	14,000	10,000	9,000
ADJUSTED COST BASE					
(i) Median Rule	13,000	13,000	12,000	12,000	10,000
(ii) Valuation Day Rule	13,000	11,000	10,000	12,000	12,000
CAPITAL GAIN (LOSS)					
(i) Median Rule	7,000	nil	2,000	(2,000)	(1,000)
(ii) Valuation Day Rule	7,000	2,000	4,000	(2,000)	(3,000)

In situation A, the middle value is valuation day value. For both methods, the capital gain will be the difference between the proceeds of disposition and the V-day value. In situation B, the middle value is the proceeds of disposition. No capital gain is, therefore, realized under the median rule. Under situation C, the original cost is the middle value. Here a loss accrued before V-day, but a recovery greater than this loss was made. A capital gain of $2,000 is realized using the median rule. The V-day method gain of $4,000 is the difference between proceeds of disposition and the V-day value.

Situation D shows a capital loss of $2,000 where the median rule adjusted cost base is $12,000. This is also the V-day value. In situation E the middle value is the original cost. The loss here is the difference between the original cost and proceeds of disposition. The loss using the valuation day rule is the difference between V-day value and proceeds of disposition.

One-half of these capital losses, realized on disposition of capital property, are called allowable capital losses and may be deducted against taxable capital gains realized in the year. Additionally, an individual may use a maximum of $2,000 of these losses to offset other income in the current year. Remaining allowable capital losses should be carried over to other years to apply against taxable capital gains and up to $2,000 of other income in those other years.

Election to use the Fair Market Value on valuation day as the adjusted cost base of property held on December 31, 1971 must be made in the return for the year in which the taxpayer first disposes of capital property other than:

- depreciable property
- an interest in a partnership
- a personal use property that is not listed personal property or real property
- a listed personal property if the gain or loss is nil because of the $1,000 rule
- a principal residence if the gain is nil.

The implication of this is that, once a method of determining the adjusted cost base on capital property owned on December 31, 1971 has been selected, it must continue to be used on other assets owned on V-day, except those listed above.

A person may reduce the capital gain by the amount of an expenditure necessary to make the property saleable. This is termed outlays and expenditures, and includes such items as fix-up costs, cleaning, real estate commission, and legal fees.

It is important to note that, for property acquired after December 31, 1971, the adjusted cost base will normally be the purchase price of the property. Special rules apply to property acquired from a related person who owned the property on V-day. In certain situations, the person who acquired the property may be deemed to have owned the property on V-day and could inherit the previous owner's actual cost. For this reason, the history of any property disposed must be considered to see if it falls within the rules.

CAPITAL GAIN RESERVES

When a farmer does not receive all the proceeds of disposition in the year of the sale of a capital property, he may be allowed to deduct a reserve based on the amount of proceeds not due until after the year end. Where a reserve is deducted in one year, it must be included in income in the following year and another reserve taken if some of the proceeds are still not due until after the second year end. The amount of the reserve is equal to the capital gain multiplied by the amount of proceeds not due until after the year end and divided by the total proceeds. Additionally, on a cumulative basis, at least one-fifth (1/5) of the capital gain must be recognized each year.

The maximum capital gain reserve is the lesser of:

(A) $\frac{\text{Balance of Principal Unpaid}}{\text{Total Transfer Price}} \times \text{Capital Gain}$

(B) $\frac{\text{Capital Gains}}{\text{Maximum Term}} \times \text{Remaining Term}$

The following example serves to illustrate this calculation. Assume a farmer sold a piece of land in 1982 for proceeds of $100,000 and the capital gain otherwise calculated was $70,000. The payment schedule called for $30 000 in the first year and the balance over a seven-year period.

Therefore in 1982:

$$A = \frac{\$\ 70,000}{\$100,000} \times \$\ 70,000 = \$49,000$$

$$B = \frac{\$\ 70,000}{5} \times 4 = 56,000$$

As a result the maximum reserve allowed is $49,000 and the capital gain recognized in the year is ($70,000 – $49,000) = $21,000. As half this amount is taxable $10,500 would be reported as income.

Year	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Payment Received	30,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
(A) Reserve based on proceeds not due	49,000	42,000	35,000	28,000	21,000	14,000	7,000	
(B) Reserve based on gain required to be recognized	56,000	42,000	28,000	14,000				
Reserve is lesser of (A) and (B)	49,000	42,000	28,000	14,000				
Gain recognized in the year	21,000	7,000	14,000	14,000	14,000			

Where certain property has been transferred by a parent to a child, the requirement to recognize a capital gain over five years is increased to a 10-year period. The property that qualifies for this treatment includes land or depreciable property used in Canada in a farming business, shares in a family farm corporation or a small business corporation, or an interest in a family farm partnership. The definition of these terms will be dealt with later.

TAX TREATMENT OF THE FARM FAMILY HOME

From the foregoing discussion, it can be seen that, as a general rule, half the amount of a person's total capital gains, less any allowable capital losses, are included in his income for tax purposes. Any gain that an individual realizes when he sells his home, however, is still tax free in most cases. With the latest set of changes to the Income Tax Act, however, the rules regarding principal residences have become quite complex where two principal residences are owned. To provide some general guidance on this topic, the following discussion attempts to respond to a few basic questions of interest to farmers.

What is a principal residence for tax purposes?

Four different requirements must be met before a property will qualify as a principal residence on which the capital gain will be tax free.

- Housing unit – The property must be a housing unit (or a leasehold or share in a housing co-op). This could be a house, apartment, condominium, cottage, mobile home, trailer or houseboat. Also included is the land on which the dwelling stands. The amount of land which will be allowed is only that land which "contributes to the use and enjoyment of the housing unit."

  What does this mean in practical terms? Up to one acre (1/2 hectare) will be accepted without question. If the claim is made that more than one acre contributes to the "use and enjoyment" of the home, it will have to be proven to the taxation authorities. Several factors will be considered in allowing such a claim, and these are set forth in paragraphs 10 and 11 of Revenue Canada's Interpretation Bulletin, IT-120R2.

- Ownership – The property must be owned by the taxpayer, either by himself or jointly with another person. The most common form of joint ownership is joint tenancy of husband and wife.

- Ordinarily inhabited – The property must be *ordinarily inhabited* by the taxpayer during each year that it is claimed as a principal residence. It is interesting to note that a seasonal residence (such as a summer cottage or ski cabin) which is used primarily for personal use may qualify as ordinarily inhabited. Paragraph 8 of the above noted Interpretation Bulletin gives Revenue Canada's position on this matter. Note that the ordinarily inhabited test extends to situations where the home is occupied solely by a spouse or former spouse. This rule will give some tax relief in situations involving separation or divorce.

- Designated as a principal residence – Revenue Canada has provided a form for this (T2091) which should be filed with the tax return for the year of disposal of a principal residence. However, if none of the gain will be taxable, the tax authorities will not insist that this form be filed.

The above factors are the basic tests of a principal residence. If the property qualifies, a special formula is used to calculate the amount of the capital gain which is exempt from tax. In most cases, this will be the entire gain.

What special alternatives exists for farmers?

The Income Tax Act allows a farmer two different ways in which to calculate his exempt gain when he disposes of his farm property.

First of all, he can hypothetically divide the farm into two portions. One part will be the farm house plus one or more acres which "contribute to its use and enjoyment". The other part will be the rest of the farm property. A reasonable allocation of the sale proceeds must then be made between the two parts. The same allocation must be made for the "adjusted cost base" (in most cases the December 31, 1971 value of the farm or original cost if it was bought after that date plus improvements). Once this is done, the capital gain on the principal residence portion and the capital gain on the rest of the farm can be calculated. The principal residence gain will be exempt from tax. The gain on the rest of the farmland will be treated in the same manner as any other capital gain which is subject to tax.

Under the second method, the farmer will not have to segregate the principal residence portion of the property in his calculations. Instead, he will take the entire proceeds of disposition, less selling expenses, and subtract his adjusted cost base to arrive at his capital gain. He can then reduce this capital gain by an amount equal to $1,000 plus $1,000 for every year that the house has been his principal residence since December 31, 1971. Part years count as full years for this purpose. If the farmer owned his farm from November 1970 to January 1983, for example, his exemption would be $1,000 plus 12 x $1,000 = $13,000. To take advantage of this second method, a farmer must file a special letter with his tax return which sets out certain information concerning the property.

The best method to use will depend on the facts in each case, but farmers should at least be aware that both methods exist and that they are entitled to use the one which gives them the larger exemption. During a period of falling real estate values,

the second method may produce beneficial results which are available only to farmers.

Can a husband and wife each have a property which is a principal residence?

Prior to December 31, 1981, it was possible for a husband and wife to each designate a home as a principal residence and have any capital gain on the house exempt from tax. With the recent changes to the Income Tax Act, a family unit may designate only one property as a principal residence for any year after 1981. A family unit will normally consist of a husband, wife and children under 18. Where a family unit owned two properties on December 31, 1981, any capital gains on the properties to that point may be exempt from tax, but the gains on only one property will be exempt after that date. The rules in this area are somewhat complex, and it is suggested anyone in this position consult a tax adviser.

What if farm home expenses are claimed?

Where a home, located on a farm, is used to earn farm income, the income tax authorities allow a farmer to claim, as a business expense, a certain portion of costs incurred in connection with the home. As a matter of administrative practice, up to one-quarter of repairs to the home and a "reasonable portion" of the cost of light, power, heat, taxes, telephone, and fire insurance will be allowed as business expenses to be deducted against farm income. **If a home is located off the farm,** no deduction for expenses will generally be allowed unless a specific part of the home was used exclusively in the course of the farming business. An example of this might be a room used exclusively as an office for maintenance of the farm records, payroll preparation and other activites of this nature. If a house on the farm is used solely for the purpose of providing lodging to hired help, the full amount of expenses incurred in connection with the house will be deductible if they are paid by the farmer.

In addition to the out-of-pocket expenses mentioned above, capital cost allowance may also be claimed on the farm house. The capital cost allowance schedule (Form T2041) shows how this claim is made for the straight-line method. For the declining balance method, the claim would be made in a similar way, with the portion of the cost of the home (excluding land) which represents the part of the home used for farm business purposes having to be calculated. Capital cost allowance would then be taken on this amount in the same manner as on any other farm building.

It is important to remember that, when a farm home is disposed of, deduction for capital cost allowance in prior years may result in some income tax. The reason for this is that a recapture may arise if the proceeds of sale which relate to the business-use portion of the farm home exceed the undepreciated balance of that portion of the home for tax purposes. This will only happen if the home was being written off on the declining balance method. Since no recapture ever occurs under the straight-line method, farmers who owned their homes at December 31, 1971 and were using the straight-line method may continue to use this method under the new tax law. They would be wise to do so if capital cost allowance is to be claimed.

As mentioned earlier, for homes (and any other depreciable assets) purchased after December 31, 1971, only the declining balance method is available. As a result, a potential recapture of capital cost allowance, and income taxes thereon, may arise in the future as a result of claims taken in prior years.

What happens to the principal residence exemption if a farm home is left in trust to a spouse on death?

This is mentioned because it is common for a family home to be left in trust to a spouse for the balance of the spouse's lifetime and then to the children when the spouse dies. No capital gain arises at the time the property rolls over to a trust created for the spouse, providing the trust meets certain conditions set out in the Income Tax Act. Even if a gain did arise at this time, it would normally be fully exempt from tax as a gain from the disposal of a principal residence.

What is of concern is a situation where a home is owned by a trust, is occupied by the surviving spouse for a period of years, and increases in value until the time it is either sold or the surviving spouse dies. One of the principal residence tests ownership – i[illegible]missing since the trust owns the property. In this case, the Income Tax Act provides a special rule which allows the trust to designate the property as a principal residence. The entire capital gain arising since December 31, 1971 may be exempted from tax, providing the proper designation is made.

Assume a farmer owned his home from 1972 to his death in 1980, during which time it increased in value by $27,000. The home was transferred to a *spouse trust* for his widow who lived in the home until her death in 1987, during which an additional increase in value of $30,000 occurred. The income tax rules are designed in such a way that both of these increases in value will be tax exempt. It is important, however, **that the appropriate designation of the property as a principal residence be made by the trust when the second disposition occurs.** If this designation is not made, exemption of the gain under the principal residence rules could be denied.

Can a farm corporation or a farm partnership own the family home?

Farm corporations and partnerships are not allowed to own a principal residence which is afforded tax exemption status. If the farm is incorporated or is owned by a partnership, the house and a parcel of adjacent land should be separated from the corporation or partnership and thereby have it qualify as a principal residence. Depending on the rules in a particular area, a subdivision of the principal residence from the corporation or partnership could alter the classification of the farm home from farmland to an acreage for tax assessment. Additionally, this transfer could create a current taxable gain in the corporation or partnership and the loss of future income tax deductions which relate to the farm home. In each farm situation, a separate determination should be made to see if any benefit will be gained by this creation of a principal residence.

Can a father and son each have a principal residence on the farm?

There are many situations today where fathers and sons are jointly farming the same farm on which each has a residence. In determining whether or not two principal residences can be designated, the concept of ownership is important. Each may designate a principal residence if they both own the farm property as tenants in common or joint tenants. Only one principal residence may be designated if either the father or the son owns the farm. It should be remembered that the more years the home is designated as a principal residence after 1971, the lesser the capital gain will be on the farm when it is sold.

INCOME AVERAGING

What is it and What Purpose Does it Serve?

Income averaging is a term applied to any system which evens out income over a period of years. It is beneficial to taxpayers to report even levels of income because individual tax rates are based on a progressive scale. The more income reported in any one year, the greater the percentage that is paid in taxes. A resident of Alberta who had a taxable income of $10,000 in 1982, for example, paid tax at a rate of 26% on his/her last dollar of income (his/her marginal rate of tax). If his/her income increased to $30,000 in 1983, his/her marginal rate of tax would rise to 35%. The federal government has recognized that farmers, in particular, could be penalized by this system purely because of the cyclical nature of the agriculture industry, where incomes can often fluctuate considerably from one year to the next. As a result, for many years farmers have been able to average their income under special rules designed to give tax relief. A table of tax rates for various levels of taxable income is contained in the Appendix.

What Income Averaging Tools are Available?

Numerous strategies may be employed in controlling wide fluctuations in income from year to year. The ones to be covered in this chapter are:

- five-year block averaging
- forward averaging
- livestock inventory provision
- registered retirement savings plans.

FIVE-YEAR BLOCK AVERAGING

This method of averaging has been available to farmers for a number of years. It has largely continued unchanged, except that it is no longer available to a corporation as was the case prior to 1972. It can be used by all individuals whose **chief source of income** (see Hobby Farmers page 33) was farming throughout the five-year period. *The Farmer's Income Tax Guide* gives an excellent summary and illustration of five-year block averaging. Keep in mind that the chief source of a person's income is a question of fact, and will be determined **separately for each year in the averaging period.**

The election to use the five-year block averaging provision is made when the income tax return is filed for that year. However, the previous four years' returns **must have been filed on time,** and the chief source of income must have been farming **for each of the five years** included in the averaging period. Form T2011 (which is included in the *Farmer's Income Tax Guide*) must be completed and filed with the return. Note that a tax return for any nil income year can still be technically filed on time if it is sent in during the year the block averaging calculation is used. As well, in making the calculation for five-year block averaging, only losses incurred in the averaging period may be deducted in computing the five-year gross income to be averaged. Non-capital losses incurred outside the block averaging period but applied against certain years in the block must be withdrawn from the block period.

The rules relating to block averaging provide that no year may be included in a five-year block average, if an amount was deducted from income under the new forward averaging provisions. Therefore, the decision as to which averaging provision to select will be based on an individual's past income and future projections. With the complexity of the new forward averaging provisions and the analysis required in comparing both averaging elections, a qualified accountant should be approached prior to any final decision.

Some of the benefits of using a five-year block average are as follows:

- When income varies from year to year within a five year period, the block average may reduce the tax payable in the year of averaging or result in a tax refund.
- A farmer is allowed to pick up any business loss and unclaimed personal exemptions incurred in the block period and apply these against years with positive net income.
- Abnormally large increases in the income stream, such as sale of inventory, recaptured capital cost allowance and the taxable portion of any capital gain, etc., can be included in a block average.
- By combining the five-year block average with the livestock inventory provision (LIP), a livestock producer under certain circumstances may elect to artificially inflate his net farm income in the year of averaging. This strategy enables all eligible farm losses and personal exemptions to be recouped. By artificially inflating the income in the year of averaging, the increase in tax payable may be minimal as the additional income is spread over a five-year period. This results in a large carryover of expense into the following year and, therefore, can be very effective if a very high income in the year succeeding the block average period is expected.

In previous years, a **doubling-up on the investment tax credit** was possible by claiming it once in the year of averaging and again in a following year. Effective for 1983, the claiming of the investment tax credit in a five-year block average has been changed such that the maximum ITC claim for any year in the block will be equal to the actual ITC claim for that year with an additional claim for the year of averaging based on the net average federal tax payable for the period. Any ITC claimed in the block average will also reduce the amount available for carryover.

FORWARD AVERAGING

With the passing into law of the provisions of the November 12, 1981 budget, the general averaging and income-averaging annuity contract provisions which were in the Act disappeared and were replaced by the new forward averaging provisions. The mechanics behind the new forward averaging provisions can result in the taxpayer retaining benefits comparable to those previously available. The most significant changes are that the new provisions will be elective and not automatic and they could require the temporary acceleration of income tax. The individual taxpayer will now decide whether or not to apply the provisions.

The new forward averaging provisions enable a taxpayer to notionally defer the recognition of income from any source to the extent that it is in excess of a calculated threshold amount. This threshold is equal to 110% of the taxpayer's inflation adjusted average net income for the previous three years. The general tax guide outlines in detail the determination of a taxpayers threshold amount. The taxpayer's income must exceed this threshold amount by at least $1,000. The amount of deferred income must be recognized in a future year, or on death, at which time tax will be paid. In making the election to defer income, the taxpayer must **pay a special refundable tax** at the maximum combined federal and provincial tax rate on this deferred income. When the income is recognized in a future year, this tax will be credited against taxes payable. To recognize inflation, the amount of income which an individual elects to forward average, as well as the special refundable tax paid, will be adjusted by an indexing factor determined from changes in the consumer price index.

The benefit to be derived from the use of forward averaging is that an unusually large jump in income in one year can be averaged over a number of future years and, given the progressive nature of the tax system, the actual tax ultimately paid on this income may be reduced. This benefit will vary, depending on:

- the level of an individual's regular taxable income
- the relationship between the forward averaged income and regular income
- changes in personal exemptions
- future residency plans

The application of these provisions may be illustrated by a simple example. Assume a farmer has sold a piece of land in 1982 and realized a taxable capital gain of $20,000. For 1982, his threshold amount is $50,000 and his taxable income, excluding this gain, is also $50,000. He expects that, for 1983, his taxable income will go down to $20,000. Assume an inflation adjustment of 6% on the amount forward averaged as well as the refundable tax credit. The tax liability, if the farmer elects to forward the $20,000, is as follows:

	1982	1983
Income eligible for forward averaging	$ 20,000	$
Less amount forward averaged	(20,000)	
Taxable amount included in income (adjusted for inflation)		21,200
Regular taxable income	50,000	20,000
Total taxable income	$ 50,000	$ 41,200
Taxes payable*	$ 16,725	$ 12,836
Refundable tax payable (recoverable)	9,418	(9,983)
Total taxes payable	$ 26,143	$ 2,853

Combined taxes payable (two years) $28,996

*Based on a Alberta provincial rate of 38.5%

If the farmer had not forward averaged the taxable capital gain, his taxes payable for the two-year period would be $25,956 for 1982 and $4,962 for 1983, for a combined taxes payable of $30,918.

As indicated earlier, given the number of factors which will influence a decision to either block average or use the forward averaging provisions, it is recommended that a farmer obtain competent professional advice.

LIVESTOCK INVENTORY PROVISION

The livestock inventory provision (sometimes referred to as partial accrual) has been available to farmers since 1972. The provision, in most cases, more than makes up for the loss of the Basic Herd option as it is a more flexible method of averaging income from year to year. The term livestock under these provisions applies to all species of livestock on the farm kept for business purposes (e.g. cattle, hogs, sheep, goats, horses, poultry, bees, fur bearing animals, etc.).

This provision allows a farmer to include in his farming income for the year any amount up to the fair market value of his livestock (other than basic herd animals) owned at the end of the year. It is, however, only available to farmers who have inventories of livestock and file on the cash basis.

The example below shows how the calculation for the provision works. In the first year, the farmer is building up his/her herd. If he/she had not bought any livestock during this year, he/she would have a net taxable income of $4,100 (not including the $12,000 loss carryover). However, because of these purchases and the loss carryover, he/she is in a high loss position. By using the livestock inventory provision, the farmer can take any amount (from $1 to $51,000) and **add it** to the net income he/she is reporting. In this case, the farmer used a value of $27,900 to add to his/her income, so he/she could use his/her personal exemptions as well as previous losses. This left him/her with an adjusted taxable income of $0. The $27,900 included in 1979 income must be deducted from income the following year. The farmer may wish to increase the value of livestock brought into income in order to pay into the Canada Pension Plan for the year. The remainder of the table shows the farmer's income position in future years and how he/she uses the livestock inventory provision to his/her advantage.

LIVESTOCK INVENTORY PROVISION

FAIR MARKET VALUE OF LIVESTOCK OWNED BY INDIVIDUAL (Excluding Basic Herd)	$51,000	$60,000	$63,000	$71,000	$71,000	$71,000
INCOME CALCULATION	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
TOTAL EARNED FARM INCOME	$35,000	$41,000	$43,000	$47,000	$58,000	$72,000
DEDUCT: Cattle purchases	$20,000	$ 3,000	nil	$ 8,000	$ 3,000	nil
Other Operating Costs	$27,000	$29,000	$26,000	$39,000	$28,000	$33,000
Losses Carried Forward from Previous Years	$12,000	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Value of Livestock Inventory Added to Income in Previous Years	nil	→ $27,900	→ $23,200	→ $11,000	→ $16,200	nil
Personal Exemptions and Other Allowable Deductions	$ 3,900	$ 4,300	$ 4,800	$ 5,200	$ 5,600	$ 6,100
NET TAXABLE INCOME (Loss)	(27,900)	(23,200)	(11,000)	(16,200)	$ 5,200	$32,900
LIVESTOCK INVENTORY VALUE Included in Income (i.e. Amount Specified up to Fair Market Value of Herd for the Year)	$27,900	$23,200	$11,000	$16,200	nil	nil
ADJUSTED TAXABLE INCOME	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 5,200	$32,900

Consider the following reasons for using the livestock inventory provision:

- If a farmer who is building up his/her herd over a period of years incurs tax losses for more than 10 years, he/she will **lose** the opportunity to deduct these losses against income. By using the method of increasing the tax value of his/her livestock inventory to reduce each current year's loss, a farmer can lessen this restriction of his/her tax losses.

- Another important consideration for arranging income in this manner concerns the utilization of personal exemptions. Assume a farmer has personal exemptions totalling $5,600 for himself/herself and his/her family. If he/she does not use them by offsetting them against his/her current year's income, then he/she will lose the opportunity to claim them. Unused personal exemptions can never be carried forward to the next year nor can they be used to increase a current loss. The farmer in our example avoided this loss simply by adding to his/her income the necessary amount from his/her livestock inventory value. His/her taxable income was nil for the taxation year 1979 through 1982, leaving him/her with no tax to pay. As well, he preserved $16,200 of deductions for the 1983 taxation year when he/she had cash income.

- Under the Canada Pension Plan, persons who are self-employed (including farmers) must contribute up to a maximum of $601.20 (1983) for the year. This maximum contribution level is based on $18,500 of self-employed earnings in the year. If less than $18,500 is earned (1983), the contribution would be correspondingly less. A farmer who reports a loss does not have to make any contributions. The benefits a person (or his/her dependants) will eventually receive from our national pension scheme are based strictly on the amount of contributions which a person has made. For this reason, it may be advantageous for a farmer to report net self-employment earnings each year **at least equal to the CPP earnings maximum.** This will ensure the maximum benefit when a person ceases to pay in and starts to collect instead. This earnings maximum has been increasing in recent years. Therefore, in planning the amount of income, the CPP earnings maxi-

mum should always be checked. This information can be found in the income tax form or T1 guide.

- The comments made for Canada Pension Plan earnings also apply in situations where a farmer may wish to purchase a registered retirement savings plan. These are discussed later in this chapter.
- A company cannot block average, but may use the Livestock Inventory Provision to its advantage when there are unused losses which must be claimed. As well, a company may use the provision to smooth out income to keep under the $200,000 annual limit, to qualify for the small business tax rate.

We have mentioned five reasons why a farmer who has inventories of livestock might wish to adjust the level of income which he reports by taking in a portion of the value of his year-end inventory. If tax returns for prior years have been filed without using this provision, it may be worthwhile to approach the tax authorities to ask for a revision of previous years to claim personal exemptions and eliminate losses. Legally, they don't have to allow the changes, but it may be worth a try.

The amount of capital cost allowance which a farmer takes for the year is also flexible (within limits) and can also be used to adjust income to a desired level. This strategy is available to all taxpayers, not only to farmers, whether they are on the cash basis or accrual basis of reporting income.

However, the farmer who is on the cash basis and who raises livestock has the most flexible situation of all. Consider the situation where a farmer has a zero net farm income before CCA and has a $100,000 balance in class 10. He/she could either a) claim no CCA, or b) claim $30,000 of CCA, creating a $30,000 loss, and add $30,000 under the livestock inventory provision. Either way, his/her net income is zero for the year. If he/she is expecting a high income in the following year, he/she would have the following deductions available to him/her under each alternative;

a) $30,000 of CCA
b) $21,000 of CCA (30% of the $70,000 UCC)
and $30,000 Livestock Inventory Expense
$51,000

By using the flexibility of the livestock inventory provision, the farmer is able to plan to minimize taxes. Thus, if a farmer doesn't make use of possible strategies, he/she may be paying more taxes at higher rates than is necessary.

REGISTERED RETIREMENT SAVINGS PLANS

Registered Retirement Savings Plans (RRSPs) are designed to encourage savings for retirement while reducing current taxable income. These plans can result in tax savings if taxable income is lower when a plan is cashed in than when contributions were being made. The following are the maximum contribution limits for the 1983 taxation year:

- Self-employed individuals or employees not covered by a registered pension plan or deferred profit sharing plan may contribute 20% of their earned income up to a maximum of $5,500 per year.
- For employees who contribute to a registered company pension plan or are covered by a deferred profit sharing plan, **the total of RRSP contributions and company pension contributions cannot exceed 20% of their earned income to a maximum of $3,500 per year.**
- Employees who are members of a registered company pension plan or are covered by a deferred profit sharing plan, but do not contribute to the pension plan, may contribute up to 20% of their earned income to a maximum of $3,500 per year.

Any amount up to the maximum for the year may be contributed to an RRSP. A portion of the maximum may be contributed to an RRSP for a taxpayer's spouse. When these funds are withdrawn, the proceeds are taxable in the hands of the spouse. If contributions are withdrawn within three years of the taxation year in which the spousal contribution was made, the funds taken out will be taxed in the contributor's hands.

In the long term, the advantage of a spousal plan is that, upon retirement (or perhaps sooner), the income would effectively be split. This will lower the overall tax rate and result in tax savings. The following table illustrates how "splitting income" saves tax:

ANNUAL RETIREMENT INCOM	$15,000	$20,000	$30,000	$50,000
A – 1983 Taxes 1 recipient	nil	1,023	3,842	10,936
B – 1983 Taxes 2 recipients	nil	258	2,840	8,506
Tax Savings by Splitting	nil	$ 765	$ 1,002	$ 2,430
After Tax Income A	$15,000	$18,977	$26,158	$39,064
After Tax Income B	$15,000	$19,742	$27,160	$41,494
Increase by Splitting		4.0%	3.8%	6.2%

The deductions in the above calculations are based on the rates in the 1983 taxation year for an Alberta resident whose spouse has no other income.

In addition to the current income tax savings afforded by contributions to RRSPs, they also offer the advantage of accumulating income within the plan without the incidence of income tax until these funds are ultimately withdrawn. If $5,500 of pre-tax earnings were paid into a RRSP each year for a ten-year period and this plan earned an average return of 10% per year, then, at the end of this period, approximately $88,000 will be accumulated. If the same annual amounts of income were subjected to income tax (at an effective tax rate of 35%) and the net amount invested at 10%, at the end of the same ten-year period $48,000 would be accumulated. Although the funds invested in the RRSP will ultimately bear tax, the resulting after-tax yield will, in all but very extreme cases, be greater than funds invested outside of an RRSP.

Furthermore individuals with widely fluctuating income may find it beneficial to contribute to RRSPs in high income years and withdraw their funds in low income years. Before deregistering an RRSP one should be aware of the costs and tax implications involved.

The above discussion on Registered Retirement Savings Plans provides some basic information. The overall benefits of using these plans as a tax management tool and investment opportunity depend on each particular situation.

PROPERTY TRANSFERS

The transfer of farm property is a subject of major importance as it often can be accomplished without the incidence of current income tax. This type of transfer is generally referred to as a rollover. This chapter discusses *rollovers* and looks at the tax consequences of transferring the farm or changing the location of the farm operation.

ROLLOVERS

A *rollover* occurs when eligible property is transferred between two parties, and the recognition of a capital gain or loss, or recaptured depreciation is **deferred** for income tax purposes. The farm rollover was a special concession to the farming community when introduced in the federal government's 1973 budget. It is one of the most significant tax planning consideration for owners of family farms. It is important to remember that the rollover is a **tax deferral**; when the property is eventually disposed of, it will be subject to tax.

A rollover can occur where:

- any capital property is transferred from an individual to his spouse or to a spouse trust
- farm land and depreciable property, used in the business of farming, are transferred from an individual to his child
- any property is transferred to a partnership
- any property, other than land inventory* or real property owned by a non-resident, is transferred to a corporation
- a share in a family farm corporation or an interest in a family farm partnership is transferred to a child
- a share in a small business corporation is transferred to a child
- eligible capital property (i.e. Quota) is transferred to a child.

* *Land inventory refers to land which, when sold, gives rise to ordinary business income rather than a capital gain; e.g. a farmer who subdivides several pieces of land may be deemed to be in the business of buying and selling land. The land, therefore, will be inventory to him.*

Transfer of Property to a Spouse

Simply stated, this rule provides that, when the property is transferred to a spouse, taxable capital gains and recaptured capital cost allowance are **deferred** until a later date. The transfer of capital property to a spouse is deemed, for tax purposes, to take place at the transferor's adjusted cost base of the property. Depreciable property is transferred at its undepreciated capital cost allowance balance. As a result of this deemed transfer value, the tax liability will be deferred until the property is sold to a third party or until the death of the spouse, at which time the taxable capital gains and recaptured capital cost allowance must be reported.

The deferral of tax will apply whether property is transferred to a spouse during the transferor's lifetime or is left by outright bequest or in trust to a spouse on the transferor's death. If a trust is used, certain requirements must be met, and these should be carefully considered at the time a person's will is drafted authorizing the trust. The lawyer or accountant should be aware of these requirements and can advise accordingly.

The purpose of this special rule is to recognize, in a limited way, the sense of the community of property which normally exists between husband and wife. For most properties transferred between a husband and wife, tax will not be payable until the property passes on to the next generation, on the death of the surviving spouse. In the case of the family farm, however, not only is it possible to obtain a rollover on a transfer to a spouse, but also to obtain similar treatment on a transfer to the next generation.

Transfer of Property to a Child

A rollover can occur when farmland, eligible capital property and depreciable property are transferred to a child. The transfer may be a sale, gift or bequest. To transfer a family farm to your child without triggering income tax on capital gains and recaptured capital cost allowance, the following five requirements must be met:

Used in the business of farming – In order to be entitled for the rollover, the property must be used, immediately before the transfer, by the taxpayer, his spouse or a child in the business of farming. The transfer may take place during the farmer's lifetime or at the time of his death. Note that there is no rule that requires the children to carry on the farming business for any specified period of time after the transfer. Note also that the owner of the property himself does not necessarily have to have been the individual who was in the "business of farming". However, if a farm is rented or leased to a third party, the rollover rule will NOT apply if the owner should die or transfer the property while the lease is in effect.

Left to a child, grandchild or great-grandchild – The farm property must be transferred to a child, grandchild or great-grandchild of the farmer. The Income Tax Act also includes son-in-law, daughter-in-law, adopted child and step child in the definition of child. The person who receives the property must be a resident of Canada at the time of transfer.

Owned by the farmer – The property must be owned by the farmer. It could, however, be held under joint ownership among the farmer and his/her spouse or children. Both forms of co-ownership, joint-tenancy and tenancy-in-common would qualify.

If two brothers owned a farm property jointly, they may have difficulty transferring their interests to their children unless they rearrange the ownership of the property before transfer. Because of the potential complexity of this reorganization, qualified advice should be sought.

Canadian property only – The property must be land or depreciable property which is situated in Canada. Only depreciable property on the declining balance method will qualify in the rollover to a child. Declining balance assets are rolled over at their undepreciated capital cost (book value for tax purposes). Straight-line depreciable property must be transferred at its fair market value. Once straight-line property has been transferred to a child, it must be depreciated using the declining balance method.

Transfer of ownership within 15 months – In the case of transfers from an estate, the ownership of the property must have been transferred to the beneficiary of the estate within 15 months. This, technically may be difficult to meet in some cases, so a longer period will possibly be allowed if special circumstances warrant.

All five basic requirements must be met in order to transfer the family farm property, either during the farmer's lifetime or upon his death, without triggering income tax. It is conceivable that such tax could be postponed indefinitely if the farm continues to be passed on from one generation to the next. It is important to note, however, that property cannot be rolled back without triggering a deemed disposition (e.g. child to father).

Where farm property is being transferred as a result of a farmer's death, the property will be acquired by the child at the farmer's tax values. Where the transfer takes place prior to the farmer's death, the two parties can select any amount between the tax value to the farmer and fair market value as the disposal proceeds. The farmer can, therefore, create an amount of income to utilize any loss carry forward or investment tax credit carryovers by his/her choice of the transfer value of the farm property to a child.

As in all situations, should the child or one of his heirs eventually transfer or sell the property outside

the family, the transfer will occur at the negotiated price. At this point, a capital gain or loss will be calculated from the original cost base. Remember that the rollover provision **only defers** income tax on capital gains or recaptured depreciation.

Having looked at the rollover of farm property to a spouse or to children, we should also consider another important aspect of the rollover provision. In drafting a will, a farmer may wish to leave a life interest in the farm property in trust for a surviving spouse with the children receiving the farm when the surviving spouse dies. In some cases, this may be a practical and desirable approach to estate planning.

Transfer of Property to a Partnership

The rollover provisions also apply when farm property is transferred to a partnership, providing certain formalities are observed. By using these provisions, it is possible for persons entering into a partnership arrangement to contribute property to the partnership without triggering tax. Because of the complexities in transferring farm property to a partnership, competent professional advice should be sought to avoid the premature realization of taxable capital gain or recaptured capital cost allowance.

Transfer of Property to a Corporation

Where a farmer wishes to incorporate the farm business, he may transfer his business assets to a corporation without incurring an immediate tax cost. The rollover allows the tax, which would otherwise arise, to be deferred either in whole or in part. The rules require, in part, that, in return for property transferred to the corporation, the taxpayer receive some shares in the corporation. As this is again a potentially complex transaction, professional advice should be sought.

Transfer of Shares in the Family Farm Corporation and of an interest in a Family Farm Partnership

The Income Tax Act allows the tranfer of an interest in a family farm partnership and of shares in a family farm corporation from a farmer to his child on a tax deferred basis. To understand these provisions, it is important to first determine what is meant by a family farm corporation and a family farm partnership:

Share of the capital stock of a family farm corporation – means a share of the capital stock of a corporation that, at the time, carried on the business of farming in Canada in which it used all or substantially all of its property and in which that person, his spouse or his child was actively engaged. This definition has been expanded in the April 19, 1983 budget to include a corporation which holds shares of a family farm corporation.

Interest in a family farm partnership – means an interest in a partnership that, at that time carried on the business of farming in Canada in which it used all or substantially all of its property and in which that person, his spouse or his child was actively engaged.

Each definition states that the entity must use "all or substantially all of its property" in farming. Revenue Canada's interpretation of the word "substantially" is normally 90% or greater. Therefore, at least 90% of the entity's property must be used in farming. Revenue Canada has stated that an asset is considered to be used in farming if more than 50% of the time it is used in farming. Therefore, if a truck is used 60% of the time in farming and 40% in some other non-farming operation, it will count towards the 90% test.

Additionally, this rollover is subject to the following rules:

- the transfer must have taken place after April 10, 1978,
- immediately before the transfer, the share must qualify as a share of a family farm corporation or the interest must qualify as an interest in a family farm partnership,
- the property transfers to a child,
- the child must be resident in Canada immediately before the transfer,
- the transfer of ownership must occur within 15 months.

As is the case with the rollover of farm property, a farmer may transfer the shares in a family farm corporation or an interest in a family farm partnership at any value between the properties' adjusted cost base and fair market value. This allows some flexibility in tax planning.

Transfer of Shares in a Small Business Corporation

There are rules which allow an individual to transfer his shares in a small business corporation to a child and to get a partial rollover. Under these provisions, the individual may defer tax on a maximum of $200,000 of capital gains. The definition of a small business corporation covers any Canadian controlled private corporation that uses all or substantially all of its assets in an active business. The definition also includes a corporation which holds shares of a small business corporation. This rollover is subject to the same rules as the family farm corporation rollover, except that the effective date is May 25, 1978.

Although this provision is not specific to farming, it can be used, in conjunction with the family farm corporation rollover to allow a farmer to transfer shares to a child. Under the family farm corporation rollover, when a farmer transfers his shares to a child for an amount in excess of his adjusted cost base, this will give rise to a capital gain to the farmer. If the farmer wishes to retire, he may need more than the adjusted cost base of his shares to live on. Using the small business corporation rollover in addition to the family farm corporation rollover, it is possible to get an additional $200,000 in proceeds on the transfer. When the spouse also owns shares in the corporation, an additional $200,000 "bump" will also be available to the spouse, for combined proceeds of adjusted cost base plus $400,000.

It should be remembered that the amount of tax deferred under these provisions is only a deferral which the child must ultimately pay when the shares are sold. As this procedure requires a certain amount of planning, professional advice should be obtained if this is contemplated.

OTHER FEDERAL INCOME TAX CONSEQUENCES TO CONSIDER

Under certain circumstances, income and capital gains which arise from any property transferred to certain family members will be taxed in the hands of the transferror. These special income tax rules are known as the *attribution rules*. The Income tax authorities have explained these rules in detail in Interpretation Bulletins IT-258R2 and IT-260R, but some of the more basic points will be discussed here:

Income from property which is transferred to a spouse or any person under the age of 18 – This income is to be reported on the tax return of the person transferring the property, not the spouse's or the minor child's. In the case of a spouse, this rule will apply as long as the transferror remains alive, legally married and resident in Canada. In the case of children, the rule ceases to apply in the year the child reaches the age of eighteen. However, if the property is used in a business, such as a farming business, these rules may not apply regardless of the child's age.

Capital gains on property transferred to a spouse or a minor child – The same principle that applies to the income from property transferred to a spouse also applies to capital gains on the property. Capital gains on property transferred to minor children, on the other hand, do not attribute back to the person who formerly owned the property. There is one exception to that rule.

Farm property transferred to minor children – This exception, referred to above is of considerable interest to farmers. If the farm property is transferred to a minor child, and the child sells or disposes of it before the year in which the child reaches age 18, any capital gains on the property will be taxed in the hands of the former owner. Although such a situation is rare, it is something of which a farmer should be aware. The rule was necessary to prevent a perceived abuse of the law when the sale of the farm to a third party was contemplated in the first instance. For example, if a farmer sold the farm to his child, and then the child sold the farm to a third party, the capital gains and recaptured capital cost allowance would be taxable in the hands of the child at lower rates of tax.

Where money is given to a spouse, any income (i.e. interest) earned on that money will be taxed in the donor's hands, not the spouse's. However, any income which is earned on the above interest will be taxed in the spouse's hands.

Alternatively, if a genuine and properly documented loan is made to a spouse, the spouse may invest the funds without the attribution rules of the Income Tax Act being applied. If such a loan is payable within a specified period, it must bear a reasonable rate of interest. If the loan is payable on demand, it need not carry a defined rate of interest.

This review of the attribution rules is somewhat oversimplified. Reference should be made to the provisions of the law and to Interpretation Bulletins IT-258R2 and IT-260R to see whether or not they apply to a particular situation. Whenever a farmer is transferring property to a spouse or to a minor child, he should thoroughly investigate the income tax consequences.

There may be situations where both a husband and wife have separate sources of income and each accumulates savings or investments in his or her own right. In a case where a person has a farming business, for example, and the spouse works off the farm, any income which is derived from the spouse's savings will always remain taxable to the spouse. Since it is usually beneficial, from an income tax point of view, to be able to split income between husband and wife, it is important to be able to substantiate the origin of the funds. If no records are kept, and the spouse has ceased to work, the tax authorities might determine that the funds in question did not come from the spouse's earnings and, therefore, the investment income should not be taxable in the spouse's hands. To avoid this, it is prudent to keep a separate accounting for each spouse's earnings and savings. In that way, the income tax authorities can be readily convinced that the income has been reported properly.

SELLING THE FARM

A person in the business of farming may decide, for various reasons, to sell his farming operation. The sale of a farm is a complex transaction having

many factors which should be taken into account before it is made. This discussion is concerned with only the tax implications of such a sale although there will also be numerous non-tax considerations. The more knowledgeable a person makes himself before the sale, the better able he will be to make use of any tax advantages which are available to him while avoiding any unexpected tax costs. All persons who contemplate the sale of their farms are urged to seek sound tax and other professional advice in advance of such a transaction.

The tax consequences of the sale of a farm can be summarized by answering the following four questions. These questions may appear quite simple, however, a closer examination of some of the simple questions reveal tax problems which might occur.

What is being sold?

The details concerning all the property which is being disposed of must be considered as follows:

- Are there any government rights or licences (such as a milk quota)? If so, special rules exist as to the tax treatment of the proceeds from the sale of the rights or licences.
- How have livestock been treated for income tax purposes? If a farmer had been using a *basic herd* and has not yet disposed of these animals, his tax treatment will differ from a farmer who did not have a basic herd at the time of sale.
- How has the farmer treated his depreciable property (buildings, vehicles, equipment, etc.) for tax purposes? When he sells his assets, the tax treatment of property which was written off on the straight-line basis will be different from the treatment of property handled on the declining balance basis.
- Does the sale of assets include property that was a principal residence of the farmer? If so, allocations of proceeds which relate to the principal residence must be made and a decision taken as to which of two basic methods will be followed in calculating the exempt portion of any capital gain. Care should be taken that the exemption for principal residence is taken to best advantage especially if more than one residence is owned.
- Are there any inventories of crops or accounts receivable which have not been previously reported in income? If so, the value of such crop inventories or accounts receivable will be brought into income at the time of sale. Special advantages may be available where an unharvested crop is sold as part of the value of the land.

The foregoing list is by no means an exhaustive summary of the types of assets which may be sold or the tax treatment attached to them, but merely an attempt to highlight the complexity of the tax considerations which are revealed under the more general question of "What is being sold?".

To whom is it being sold?

The question of "to whom" is also deceiving. As discussed earlier if the sale is made on a non-arm's length basis (to a spouse for example), special tax rules apply. A sale to the farmer's children, grandchildren or great-grandchildren will involve different rules again. If a farmer is selling his assets to a corporation in which he is a shareholder, or to a partnership of which he is a member, there is, once again, a different set of rules applicable. Even the sale to a third party may not be free from complications, particularly if the farmer who is selling the property decides to leave the country for his retirement. If he ceases to be a resident of Canada, certain reserves which he may have claimed against the unrealized portion of his capital gain will no longer be available to him. Also, by leaving Canada, he will place a responsibility on the person who **bought** the farm to withhold tax (the rate will vary from 15% – 25% depending on the country in which the recipient lives) on interest payments made under the financing arrangements. This amount must then be remitted to the Canadian tax authorities. If property is being sold to someone who is not a resident of Canada, there may be special rules to be followed under a provincial land ownership act.

An explanation of any provincial legislation is available from your local district agriculturist's office. In addition, federal legislation, such as the Foreign Investment Review Act, may apply.

For how much is it being sold?

In answering this question one must consider several important factors. First of all, if various assets are sold as a package, the proceeds from the sale must be allocated to each asset group on a reasonable basis. If possible, it is desirable to specify in the sale agreement the sale proceeds applicable to **each** asset being sold. In addition, if the property was owned at December 31, 1971, a V-day value must be determined for each asset owned. Thirdly, the historical cost of each asset must be determined wherever possible.

This type of documentation is necessary to determine the amounts of capital gains and losses, income gains and losses, recapture of capital cost allowance or terminal losses which arise as a result of the sale. The allocation of the sale proceeds to the various assets will have a direct effect on the amount of income tax which must be paid. The same allocations which apply to the purchaser must also apply to the vendor.

How will payment be made?

This question does not appear to involve tax considerations until one considers the hardship which can arise if a person is subject to tax on income before he/she actually receives the cash. As discussed in the capital gains section, there are provisions in the Income Tax Act which allow a deferral on the realized taxable capital gains where the proceeds will be collected over a period of years. These rules, however, also encourage an instalment period which might be shorter than what has otherwise been negotiated.

The tax consequences to consider on the sale of a farm are numerous. They are also complex, and this complexity can work both to the advantage and to the disadvantage of the farmer. For this reason, tax advice should be sought **before an offer to purchase is signed** to ensure that no hardship is caused to the farmer and that use is made of every tax advantage available to him. For many farmers, the value realized when a farm is sold represents the financial accumulation of a lifetime. It is important that he enjoy the maximum amount to which he is entitled.

EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY – REPLACEMENT PROPERTY PROVISION

Voluntary Exchange

Effective March 31, 1977, the tax rules were changed to allow a tax-deferred rollover of certain business assets if they are replaced by similar business assets by the end of the taxation year immediately following the year of disposal. To qualify for this rollover:

- the provisions are restricted to land and buildings used in a business immediately before the disposition,
- the replacement asset must be purchased before the end of the first taxation year following the disposition of the original asset,
- a letter of election (notification of intent) must be filed in the tax return for the year the replacement property is acquired,
- the replacement asset must be used in the same or similar business as the original asset, and
- if the owner was not a Canadian resident, the property must be taxable Canadian property.

Farmland that is being sharecropped would not qualify under these rules, nor would rented property unless the owner was in the rental business. Revenue Canada appears to be taking a fairly liberal view on selling one type of farm and buying another. For example, selling a grain farm and buying a hog farm would apparently qualify under the replacement property provision.

Where a replacement property is not acquired until the following taxation year, any recaptured CCA or taxable capital gain from the sale of the original business assets must be reported, and tax paid, in the year of the sale. When the replacement property is purchased (within the time limits set above), and the relevant election is made, the tax return for the year of sale will then be reassessed to determine the amount of refund. An appropriate planning strategy would be to arrange for the sale and purchase of properties within the same taxation year.

It is also feasible to buy the replacement property before selling the original property. One must still make the required election in year of purchasing the replacement property but there is no time restriction for selling the property to be replaced. If you are contemplating a sale of property in the future but are purchasing new property this year one should make the replacement property election in order to take advantage of this tax deferral at a later date.

The following example illustrates how an exchange of property defers capital gain:

Assume a farmer acquired a section of land in 1972 at a cost of $160 per acre. The aggregate purchase price of $102,400 was allocated between land and buildings as follows:

Land	$ 68,300
Farm Buildings (barn, granary, etc.)	21,300
House	12,800
	$102,400

In January 1983, the farm was sold for $600 per acre. The proceeds of the sale, fully paid at the time of sale, are allocated as follows:

Land	$312,000
Farm Buildings	48,000
House	24,000
	$384,000

The undepreciated capital cost of the farm buildings immediately prior to the sale was $9,000. Without the deferral provisions, the farmer would realize capital gains and recaptured capital cost allowance on the sale as follows:

CAPITAL GAINS

Land Proceeds	$312,000
Adjusted Cost Base	68,300
Capital Gain	$243,700
Farm Buildings Proceeds	$ 48,000
Cost	21,300
Capital Gain	$ 26,700

RECAPTURED CCA

Farm Buildings Cost	$ 21,300
Undepreciated Capital Cost	9,000
Recapture	$ 12,300

Total capital gains and recapture to be included in income:

TAXABLE CAPITAL GAINS

Land (1/2 x $243,700)	=	121,850	
Farm Buildings (1/2 x $ 26,700)	=	13,350	135,200
RECAPTURE			12,300
TOTAL			$147,500

The farmer would report $147,500 of income from taxable capital gains and recaptured CCA from the sale of his/her farm. The gain on the house has been excluded because it was treated as his/her principal residence. However, in March 1983, he/she decides to purchase a replacement farm at a cost of $625 per acre. The total purchase price is allocated as follows:

Land	$321,000
Farm Buildings	60,000
House	19,000
	$400,000

By electing to defer the capital gain and recaptured capital cost allowance under the replacement property provision, the farmer would adjust the cost, for tax purposes, of the new farm assets as follows:

LAND

Actual Cost	$321,000
Less: Capital Gain deferred on sale of former land	243,700
Equals: Cost Base for Tax Purposes	$ 77,300

FARM BUILDINGS

Actual Cost	$ 60,000
Less: Capital Gain deferred on sale of former buildings	26,700
Equals: Capital Cost of Replacement Building	$ 33,300
Less: Recapture of CCA deferred on sale of former building	12,300
Equals: Undepreciated Capital Cost	$ 21,000

The above calculations or adjustments show how capital gains and recapture are deferred. These adjusted values will be used in calculating capital gains and recapture on the sale of the farm in the future.

To further assist in understanding the amount of gain which will be deferred in selling one property and purchasing another, the following table has been prepared:

Cost of Replacement Property	Amount of Capital Gains Deferral
– Equal to, or greater than the proceeds from the sale of the former property	Full Deferral
– Less than proceeds, but greater than the adjusted cost base of the former property	Partial Deferral
– Equal to, or less than the adjusted cost base of former property	No Deferral

In summary, when a farmer is looking at the relocation of a farm business, the following questions should be considered:

- Will the purpose of the intended use of the replacement properties be the same or similar to the purpose for which the former property was used?
- Are the present properties being used for the purpose of earning income from a business?
- If the present properties are disposed of, when does the time limit for purchase of replacement properties expire?
- What is the value or cost of the replacement properties compared to the value of the properties being sold?

- Will it be possible to defer all or only a part of the gain from the sale of property and purchase of replacement property?

Answers to these questions should define the situation. Also, professional assistance should be obtained to ensure that the transactions are executed in an appropriate manner.

Involuntary Dispositions

As is the case with the voluntary exchange of property discussed above, all or part of any gain on the disposition of a capital property which results from an involuntary disposition of that property may possibly be deferred. All or part of the recapture of capital cost allowance on the disposition of depreciable property may also be deferred. An involuntary disposition generally refers to property that has been expropriated, lost or destroyed.

The replacement property provisions for involuntary dispositions are similar to the rules which apply for voluntary dispositions, with two important exceptions: 1) The time limit for replacing such property is the end of the **second** taxation year following the year in which the property was expropriated. 2) The provisions apply to most capital and depreciable property.

It is important to note that, when property is expropriated, lost or destroyed, payment is often not received quickly. This fact is recognized by the tax authorities and the year of the disposition for tax purposes, will generally be extended to the taxation year in which an amount becomes receivable in respect of that property. Again, to ensure that you keep the flexibility of this tax provision, you should seek competent tax advice for each specific situation.

HOBBY FARMERS

Although the terms hobby farmer and gentleman farmer are often used in referring to individuals who keep a few animals or grow a few acres of crops or vegetables, the Income Tax Act does not make use of these terms. The major problems with hobby farmers are: 1) whether their operation constitutes a farming business for income tax purposes, and 2) the amount of loss, if any, which can be deducted from other income. To understand how the income tax laws work with regard to farm income and losses, it is necessary to distinguish three types of farmers.

First of all there is the person who carries on a farming operation but has **no real expectation of ever making it a profitable venture.** In such cases, **none** of the expenses incurred in the farm operation would be deductible for income tax purposes as they would not have been incurred for the purpose of earning income from a business. Therefore they would be considered to be personal or living expenses of the individual. Such a person would normally depend on a source of income other than farming to provide for his needs.

Next, there is the person who can truly be said to be in the business of farming because his farming operations do hold a reasonable expectation of profit. However, farming is not his *chief source* of income. Nor can it be said that farming and some other source (such as employment) constitute the person's chief source of income. Nevertheless he is engaged in the business of farming with the intention of making a profit and must report his revenue and may deduct the expenses incurred to earn it. This is the person who is often called a hobby farmer or gentleman farmer. He is treated essentially the same as a *bona fide* farmer (a full time farmer) except that he may be restricted in the amount of farm losses that he can claim against other income, and is not entitled to use the five-year block averaging provision. Whether or not farming constitutes the person's chief source of income is the basic test in all cases. For simplicity, we will refer to all persons in this category as hobby farmers.

The last category of course, is the full time farmer whose operations are unquestionably the chief source of his/her livelihood. All of the special provisions which exist for farmers under our tax laws are available to him/her.

The facts in each case will always determine which of the three categories is appropriate. Many taxpayers have gone to court in an attempt to establish that they were hobby farmers or full time farmers when the tax department did not agree and either denied or restricted the losses which they attempted to claim. There are a great many court cases on this subject, each with its own peculiarities and each one decided on its own particular facts.

Recent cases have given a clearer indication of the criteria used to distinguish hobby farmers from bona fide farmers. The primary case in this respect is the Supreme Court of Canada decision of Moldowan v. The Queen (1977). The prime distinguishing factors were taken to be:

- the time spent in the farming operation

- the capital committed to the operation
- the profitability of the operation, both actual and potential
- a clearly demonstrated intention to make farming a chief source of income.

Recent cases have used these criteria in deciding whether a farming operation belongs in the hobby farm category or the fulltime farmer category. Cases to note would be Graham v. The Queen (1983), Kasper v. The Queen (1983) or Bio-Test Labs v. MNR (1982).

Interpretation Bulletin (IT-322R) on this subject would be of interest for people who operate farming businesses in addition to having other income-earning activities.

The tax regulations affecting the hobby farmer can be summarized by answering the following questions:

What are the Loss Restrictions for Hobby Farmers?

The Income Tax Act states that where a taxpayer's chief source of income for a taxation year is neither farming nor a combination of farming and some other source of income, a loss sustained from the business of farming is only allowed to reduce income of that year from all other sources to the extent of the lesser of:

a) your farming loss for the year, or
b) 2,500 plus the lesser of
   i) one half of the amount by which your farming loss for the year exceeds $2,500 or
   ii) $2,500

In other words, a hobby farmer is limited to an overall farming loss deduction against other income of $5,000. The farming loss for the year would have to be at least $7,500 in order to deduct the maximum amount. Consider the following example:

In 1981, a hobby farmer incurred a farming loss of $4,500. In 1982, he/she incurred further losses of $5,000. In 1983, he/she earned a farming income of $1,000.

Under the restricted loss provision, he/she would calculate the loss deduction as follows:

1981 – $4,500 farming loss

$$\text{Maximum deductions} = \$2{,}500 + \frac{(\$4{,}500 - 2{,}500)}{2}$$
$$= \$2{,}500 + \$1{,}000$$
$$= \$3{,}500$$

The unused portion ($4,500 – $3,500 = $1,000) is the "restricted farm loss".

1982 – $5,000 farming loss

$$\text{Maximum deduction} = \$2{,}500 + \frac{(\$5{,}000 - 2{,}500)}{2}$$
$$= \$2{,}500 + \$1{,}250$$
$$= \$3{,}750$$

The unused portion ($5,000 – $3,750 = $1,250) is the "restricted farm loss".

For the 1981 and 1982 taxation years, the hobby farmer has been allowed to deduct $3,500 and $3,750 in losses from other income for each year. However, he/she had restricted farm losses from each year. These losses may now be carried back three years or forward ten years from the year in which they are incurred. The restricted farm losses, however, may **only** be applied against **farming income.**

In 1983, the hobby farmer earned a farm income of $1,000. He/she would now apply the restricted farm losses against this income:

Farm Income	$1,000
Less:	
Loss Carryover	$1,000
Net Farm Income	$ 0

In this example, the earlier restricted loss is used first (1981), and a balance of $1,250 in restricted farm losses remains to be carried forward and applied against future farming income.

In cases where certain "scientific research"* expenditures have been made, these expenses may be deducted in addition to the $5,000 allowed for the year.

Can hobby farmers use the cash method of reporting their income?

Yes. As discussed earlier, the "cash method can be used to report farm income by all persons who are in the 'business of farming'". If a current loss exceeds the amount which would currently be deductible, a hobby farmer who raises livestock can bring in part or all of the value of his/her livestock inventory and reduce the amount of the loss. This rule gives hobby farmers who have livestock inventories considerable flexibility in the amount of income or loss which they may wish to report. It is another good reason for a person in the farming business to use the cash method to report income.

* *"Scientific research" is defined to mean a systematic investigation or search carried out in a field of science or technology by means of experiment or analysis.*

Can a hobby farmer use all the income averaging methods which are available to a full-time farmer?

No. He/she cannot use the five-year block-averaging method because only individuals whose chief source of income is from farming can use that method. However, all the other types of averaging which were discussed earlier are available to hobby farmers.

Can hobby farmers use the special $1,000 per year exemption for gains on a principal residence that is situated on the farm?

Yes. As long as the property is a principal residence which is situated on land used in a farming business that was carried on by him/her or certain members of his family, it appears that a hobby farmer can use this special rule in the same manner as a full time farmer. As outlined earlier, when the property is disposed of, there are two ways in which a farmer can calculate the amount of capital gain which will be exempt from tax under the principal residence rules. He/she can either sever the principal residence portion from the rest of the farm to determine his/her exempt capital gain, or he/she can take a special exemption of $1,000 plus $1,000 for each year he/she has lived in the home since December 31, 1971.

Is the investment tax credit available for depreciable assets acquired used by a hobby farmer?

Yes. Provided all tests for the investment tax credits are met, there is no reason why it cannot be claimed by a hobby farmer.

Is the farm rollover available to hobby farmers?

This is not an easy question to answer since so much will depend on the facts in each situation. All the requirements which have to be met to qualify for any of the farm rollovers were discussed earlier. Generally speaking, the rollover under the Income Tax Act appears to apply to the hobby farmer just as it does to a full time farmer.

Are corporations or partnerships subject to the restricted farm loss provision?

Yes. If neither farming nor a combination of farming and some other source of income can be said to be the chief source of income of the corporation or partnership members, the loss restrictions will apply. The fact that the taxpayer is a corporation or that the farming is carried on by a partnership (which must calculate its income as if it were a separate taxpayer) does not make any difference in the hobby farm rules.

If a hobby farm is sold, what happens to the unused restricted farm losses?

The property taxes and interest on borrowed funds to acquire the property that are included in the restricted farm loss, may be added to the cost base of the land for purposes of determining capital gains. The remaining restricted farm loss would be foregone.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FAMILY FARM

Of the tax planning strategies available to farmers, perhaps the most important is that of selecting the form of organization under which the business will be operated. The type of business organization which is used affects the taxation of the business, and in the longer run, has implications on estate planning.

This section looks at the types of business organization which are seen in farming, and discusses some of their advantages and disadvantages.

There are many tax and legal implications to any agreement. Because individual farm situations vary considerably, it is important that all factors be taken into consideration in deciding which form of business organization best suits the specific situation.

SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP

Sole proprietorship is the most common type of business arrangement in the farming community. The farm assets are owned by the farmer as an individual (or perhaps jointly with a spouse) and all the income produced by the business is reported by the farmer on his Personal Income Tax Return for the year. The farmer is in the same position under the law as any other individual who carries on a business for himself.

Advantages of a Sole Proprietorship

- Simplicity

  The sole proprietorship is popular because of its

simplicity. The cost to start up is lower, and it is cheaper to operate since accounting and legal advice is not as complex as with other types of business organizations.

- Flexibility

  In a sole proprietorship, a farmer can take action without having to consult anyone else because, generally, he/she must accept the consequences of his/her decisions. Because of this flexibility of operation, the sole proprietor can more easily adjust to changing conditions.

- Income splitting

  Since 1980 a sole proprietor has been able to pay a salary to a spouse. This salary or wage must be reasonable for the type and amount of work being done by the spouse.

- Income averaging methods can be utilized

  As discussed earlier, an individual farmer has several types of income averaging methods available to reduce his income tax burden. The most important of these are the five-year block-averaging, the livestock inventory provision and forward averaging.

- Offset losses against other income

  Any farm losses which are incurred are deductible from other income which the farmer may have. Such losses which are not claimed in the year incurred can be carried back three years or forward ten years.

- A rollover of farm property is available

  A tax-deferred rollover of farm property to a child can be made either during the farmer's lifetime or at the time of his death. This is an important factor as it concerns both tax and estate planning.

- Income tax installments

  Unincorporated farmers only have to pay taxes twice a year, December 31 and April 30 of the following year.

- Principal residence

  Only individuals who carry on the business of farming are able to use the capital gains exemptions available on disposition of the farm home.

- Small business bonds

  These bonds are available to individuals or partnerships that are currently in financial difficulty. The interest on these bonds is deemed to be a dividend and therefore it will not be taxable to financial institutions but will not be deductible by the borrower. These bonds are available until December 31, 1985.

Disadvantages of a Sole Proprietorship

- Progressive tax rates

  All the income earned from the sole proprietorship is reported on the farmer's personal tax return. The income will be subject to tax at marginal rates, which range as high as 56% in some provinces (49% in Alberta in 1984). As mentioned above, the income averaging methods available can be used to help spread out the tax burden but, nevertheless, for farmers in high income brackets the tax can be excessive compared to other business arrangements.

- No limitation of legal liability

  The sole proprietorship carries with it personal liability for the owner. In effect, whatever assets are owned, whether personal or business, are often committed to underwrite any financial obligations. The limited liability which a corporation provides (to a degree) may not make a great deal of difference in a practical, day-to-day sense, but such liability becomes important if the business is sued. Liability insurance may provide an alternative to consider. However, if a farm encountered financial difficulties, any assets held outside a farm corporation could be protected from the claims of creditors. Where the farm is unincorporated, no such protection would be available.

- Lack of employee benefits

  A sole proprietor is a self-employed person, so a number of the benefit plans which would be available to an employee do not apply. For example, such things as group insurance, deferred profit sharing plans, registered pension plans, and unemployment insurance could not be used.

- Transferring ownership is more difficult

  In a sole proprietorship, ownership of the assets (such as real property, vehicles, equipment etc.) is recorded in the farmer's name. Transferring the ownership of such a business is more cumbersome than when all business assets are owned by a limited company. In a sole proprietorship, each asset must be transferred separately. To transfer his assets, a shareholder of a company need only transfer the ownership of the shares of the company.

- Continuity of business not assured

  With only one person involved in a sole proprietorship, a lack of continuity can be brought about by an untimely death. As well, it is often difficult to make successor arrangements in this type of organization.

JOINT VENTURE

A Joint Venture is a formalized business arrangement and is **not** a business entity such as a partnership or corporation.

Perhaps the best definition of a Joint Venture is found in the handbook set out by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. It is defined as follows:

> "A Joint Venture is an arrangement whereby two or more parties (the venturers) jointly control a specific business undertaking and contribute resources towards its accomplishment. The life of the joint venture is limited to that of the undertaking which may be of short or long term duration depending on the circumstances."

In other words, a joint venture is the bringing together of two or more sole proprietors in order to farm jointly for profit. There is no intention to form a legal partnership. Each individual retains ownership of his/her assets.

There are two reasons for establishing a joint venture. The first, and the most important, is to avoid the costs associated with the dissolvement of a legal partnership. Secondly, if a partner no longer desires or is unable to perform the labor activities on a farm, it is possible to maintain an active farming status with a joint venture. This is accomplished by providing management and capital in lieu of labor. Therefore, he may still may be able to roll the farm tax free to a child.

In view of the income tax implications to being involved in a partnership and in view of the close similarity between a partnership and a joint venture, it is important to ensure that the participants do not inadvertently create a partnership relationship. It should be pointed out that Interpretation Bulletin No. IT-90 sets out certain general rules for determining whether or not a business relationship is that of a partnership or one which comprises a joint venture.

PARTNERSHIPS

Prior to tax reform in 1972 partnerships were not recognized as separate entities for income tax purposes. The income earned by each partner of the business was taxable in the hands of the partner who had earned it, in a similar manner to the income from a sole proprietorship. Under our new tax laws, income for tax purposes is calculated primarily at the **partnership** level. As well, there is also a need to maintain a record of each partner's equity interest in each of the partnership's assets for tax purposes. The rules regarding partnerships have created a certain level of complexity in the tax laws.

The federal Income Tax Act does not define specifically what a partnership is. To clarify a partnership for tax purposes, Revenue Canada has issued the following statement:

> Generally speaking, a partnership is the relation that subsists between persons carrying on business in common with a view to profit. However, co-ownership of one or more properties associated with a business, (which under Common Law might be a joint tenancy or a tenancy in common), does not of itself create a partnership, and this is so regardless of an arrangement to share profits and losses. For guidance on whether a particular arrangement at a particular time constitutes a partnership, reference should be made to the relevant provincial law on the subject and such law will be viewed as persuasive by the Department of National Revenue.

It is very important to determine whether or not a particular arrangement between two or more people will be a partnership for tax purposes. As indicated in the above statement, the co-ownership of property will not in itself indicate that a partnership exists. However, if two persons own a farm jointly and actively operate it together, sharing the net income (or loss) produced by the farm, there is a strong presumption that they are in partnership. Alternatively, where a farmer owns a farm but lets another person operate it on a share-cropping basis, there would not be a partnership. The income from such an arrangement would be considered property income, which is treated in a similar manner to rentals.

It is important to remember that it is the facts of each situation which will decide whether or not a partnership exists before the income tax consequences of the arrangement can be determined. If a partnership is desired a formal partnership agreement should be drafted and executed for greater certainty.

Advantages of a Partnership

- Simple to set up

  Setting up a partnership is relatively simple. The costs are not high in comparison to the creation of a limited company.

- Continuity in illness

  Two or more persons can participate in the business enabling the pooling of resources. This results in a continuity of the business operation should one partner become ill.

- Flexibility of fiscal year end

  The partnership may select a fiscal year end for its business and each partner would then report

his income from the partnership in the tax year the fiscal period ended. This could have some tax and business advantages.

- Averaging provisions available

  Income from a farming partnership will retain its character as income from a farming business in the hands of each partner. As a result, the income averaging methods discussed previously may be used.

- Tax-deferred rollover of property to a Canadian partnership

  As discussed earlier, it is possible for persons entering into a partnership arrangement to contribute property to the business without incurring an immediate tax cost. Such a rollover allows any gain on the property to be deferred until the partnership disposes of the asset or the partner disposes of his partnership interest.

- Tax-deferred rollover of an interest in a family farm partnership

  The rollover of an interest in a family farm partnership to a child is possible where, immediately before the rollover, the partnership carried on the business of farming in which it used the majority of its assets, and in which the farmer, his spouse, or child was actively engaged.

- Splitting of income between husband and wife

  It is possible to have a partnership between husband and wife and save tax through splitting income. However, the tax authorities may attempt to disallow the partnership and tax the income in one spouse's hands. Where both spouses are actively engaged in the business, or one spouse is actively engaged in the business and the other spouse has invested his or her own property in the business, the operation may qualify as a legitimate partnership for tax purposes. A recent tax case in this area has made the creation of husband and wife partnerships more acceptable. In this case, Berg V. MNR (1982), the judge upheld the taxpayer's contention that there indeed existed a husband and wife partnership even though no written partnership agreement existed. They were able to demonstrate that the wife had made substantial contributions, in capital and labor, and that she was actively engaged and quite knowledgeable in the farming operation. The subject of husband-wife partnerships is controversial, so each situation should be considered carefully.

Disadvantages of a Partnership

- Complex tax accounting

  There are increased accounting costs for a partnership. Depending on the size and complexity of the agreement, they can be fairly large.

- Difficult to collapse

  Partners wishing to dissolve a partnership undertake a major task. The cost base of each partner's interest in the partnership must be established to determine if there are any capital gains to be realized on dissolution.

- Progressive tax rates

  As discussed in the sole proprietorship, partners, who are individuals, will pay progressive rates of individual tax. It should be noted that a partnership could also be formed between corporations or individuals and corporations.

- No limitation of legal liability

  A sole proprietor has limited protection from legal action which could be launched against him. Generally, members of a partnership are not only liable for their own actions but are also jointly liable for the actions of business partners arising from the operation of the partnership. Limited liability partners, however, would only risk the loss of their capital investment should a legal dispute arise. Therefore, choosing a business partner is not something to be taken lightly.

- Capital cost allowance at partnership level

  For depreciable assets owned by the partnership, capital cost allowance is claimed at the partnership level before it is allocated to the individual partners. This reduces the flexibility of varying the claim to suit each partner's specific requirements. As well, the livestock inventory provision on animals owned by the partnership must be used at the partnership level.

- Method of reporting income

  In a partnership, all partners must agree to the method of reporting income, cash or accrual.

CORPORATIONS

The corporation is another form of business organization that the farm unit can use. The corporation (or company) is a separate legal "person" for income tax purposes.

Where a farmer decides to incorporate, by rolling his/her assets into a company, the corporation is in the business of farming. In rolling his/her assets into a corporation, the farmer receives shares in the corporation and is a shareholder of the company. He/she may also be an employee of the farm corporation. His/her spouse and children may be shareholders or employees as well, depending on how the organization is set up and the purposes it is designed to achieve.

The corporation is different from the sole proprietor and partnership forms of business organization because it does not pay income tax at progressive rates on its earnings. In 1983 the federal

tax rate for small business corporations was 15%. This rate applies to taxable income from $1.00 to $200,000 each year up to a cumulative total of $1,000,000. The provinces levy taxes on small business corporations at rates varying from 3% to 12% (Alberta 5%) which form combined rates ranging from 18% to 27% (Alberta 20%). If taxable income exceeds the $200,000 limit, the combined tax rate is approximately 50% on the amount in excess of this limit. The shareholders also pay tax on any dividends received from the company. The amount included in income is equal to 150% of the actual dividend received. However, there is also a dividend tax credit which the shareholder can claim. This dividend tax credit effectively gives the shareholder a credit for the taxes paid by the corporation units income. In addition to the income taxes paid by the corporation, there is a corporate distributions tax paid by the coroporation equal to 12.5% of any dividend paid out of income earned after 1982 which qualified for the low rates of tax. The effect of the corporate income tax, corporate distributions tax, gross-up and dividend tax credit mechanism is that the same amount of tax will be paid whether income is earned by a corporation or by an individual. This concept is known as "integration". An example may serve to illustrate this concept. Assume that the combined corporate tax rate on small business income is 25% and that the shareholder is in a 50% marginal tax bracket.

Corporation	
Income earned by corporation	$ 100.00
Income tax paid (25%)	25.00
Income available for distribution	75.00
Corporate distributions tax	8.33
Dividend paid to shareholder	$ 66.67
Shareholder	
Dividend received	$ 66.67
Gross-up	33.33
Taxable income	100.00
Income tax (50%)	50.00
Dividend tax credit	33.33
Income tax liability	$ 16.67
Total Tax	
Corporation – Income tax	$ 25.00
– Distribution tax	8.33
Shareholder	16.67
	$ 50.00

It should be noted that, owing to the differing provincial tax rates, the actual results may differ but the mechanics will be the same. For example, in Alberta, where the provincial tax rates are lower, there would be a benefit to earning income through a corporation in that the total taxes paid will be lower than if the income was earned personally. The other benefit from a tax point of view arises when the shareholders are able to leave income in a corporation. The first incidence of tax which arises at the corporate level will be taxed at a lower rate than personal rates on the same amount of income. The second level of taxation does not arise until funds are actually paid out to a shareholder as dividends. Accordingly, if the funds are left in a corporation, a larger amount of cash would be available for investment in the farming operation than if the same amount of income was earned by an individual. Generally the optimal position is found where an individual's employment income from the farm corporation is sufficient to raise his marginal tax rate to the level of the corporate tax rate.

Generally speaking, as far as the day-to-day operation of the farm is concerned, not a great deal will appear to have changed. However, there are some details which will change. For example, purchases and other expenditures will be made in the company's name, sales of farm products will also be made in this name, and a bank account will exist in the name of the corporation. Where land is transferred to the corporation, the annual notice for property taxes will be made out to the corporation instead of the farmer as an individual.

Advantages of a Corporation

- Limited liability

  Perhaps one of the most obvious advantages of the corporation is its limited liability. We often see "Ltd." after the name of the company which indicates a "limited company". Basically, this refers to the exposure of the company's assets to legal action. Any legal action taken by creditors could only be against the assets owned by the company. For the farmer who owns personal assets outside the company, this offers protection. However, where the farmer has signed a loan with his personal guarantee, the advantage of this limited liability is greatly reduced.

- Income splitting

  The corporation may pay both the husband and wife a salary for services rendered, enabling the splitting of income. In this way, taxes are saved and both can contribute to the Canada Pension Plan. As well, there will be more personal exemptions as both will have income on which these may be claimed.

- Permanence

  Unlike an individual, the corporation can live forever. It would cease to exist only if it failed and its creditors had its affairs wound up or if it is struck off the register held by the Registrar of Companies because statutory requirements have not been met. The corporation can also cease to exist if the shareholders should decide to liquidate the company.

- Ease of transferability

  The transfer of ownership in an incorporated farming business only requires the farmer to transfer shares in the limited company. For an unincorporated business to be transferred, ownership of each individual asset would need to be changed. The corporation also provides a great deal of flexibility of estate planning in this regard.

- Tax-deferred rollover of property to a corporation

  As discussed earlier it is possible to transfer assets into a corporation without incurring an immediate tax burden. Instead, the tax which would otherwise arise may be deferred, either in whole or in part.

  It is also possible to transfer the shares in a family farm corporation to the children without triggering any tax.

- Flexibility of year end

  As with the sole proprietorship and partnership, the corporation may select a year end which best suits the operation.

- Flexiblity in tax planning

  The income tax rules which govern the taxation of income earned in a corporation are more complicated than those of other business organizations, but, they do provide a great deal of flexibility in tax planning. Very briefly, here are some examples:

  - the ability to adjust salaries and dividends paid out to the shareholders
  - automatic averaging – because the corporation pays tax at one rate, there is, essentially, an automatic average tax rate
  - greater use of certain employee benefit plans such as deferred profit sharing plans and group insurance plans
  - dividend tax credit on dividends paid to shareholders.

Disadvantages of a Corporation

- Increased costs for start-up and yearly operation

  The corporation is a fairly complex organization and is, therefore, more costly to set up than other forms of business arrangements. As well, with extra accounting required for the operations, the yearly operating costs will be greater.

- Small business rate restricted to active business income

  Any capital gains realized or investment income earned by a corporation are not eligible for the reduced small business rate. They will be taxed at a higher rate, which for 1983 is approximately 50%. Included in this rate, however, is a refundable tax of 16.67 % which may be recovered upon payment of dividends.

- Losses not offset against other income

  Any losses which are incurred in the company cannot be deducted from the income of its shareholders. Remember, the corporation is a separate legal person.

- Withholding taxes on salaries

  Salaries which are paid to employees of the company must have the appropriate taxes, Canada Pension Plan and Unemployment Insurance (in some cases) contributions deducted and forwarded to Revenue Canada. This creates additional accounting costs.

- Splitting up the farm

  Although it is possible to transfer assets into a corporation on a rollover basis, it is very difficult to transfer assets out of a corporation on a tax deferral basis.

Additional Comments on Farm Incorporation

Farmers have shown a significant amount of interest in farm corporations. With the recent tax changes regarding the rollover of shares in a family farm corporation, this interest has increased. In connection with incorporating the farm, the following questions are often asked:

- How big should my farm be before I benefit from incorporation?

  In general, the farm should be earning income at a level where the tax advantages of incorporation become effective. At lower levels of farm income, there are other tools available to help reduce taxes, making incorporation uneconomical.

- How much can I pay my wife?

  For a farm wife who works for the company, any wage which is reasonable for the type of work being done would be acceptable. A guideline might be whatever you would pay someone else to do the same work.

- Who runs the farm corporation?

  The farm corporation is controlled by those who own the majority of voting shares. Significant decisions are usually made at an annual meeting or by the board of directors. Day-to-day decisions are made by the individual responsible for the normal farm operation. Despite the formality of the corporation, a farmer and his wife would normally control the board of directors and would be making the decisions as before. However, if a farmer brought in more shareholders, this could change.

- Do shareholders have to be actively farming before they can roll over their shares in the corporation?

  Under the extended rollover provision, only one

member of the immediate family need be actively involved in running the farm. Other shareholders may work wherever they choose. It is important, as well, to ensure that a member of the immediate family is always farming any land that has been left out of the company. In this way, the transfer of the farming business to a future generation will not cause an immediate tax burden.

The above are only some of the questions about incorporating which are frequently asked. However, it is not possible to go into greater detail in this publication. Due to the complexity and consequences of various arrangements for farm businesses, seeking qualified professional guidance before making any decision is recommended.

ESTATES

The tax consequences on farm property when the owner dies are greatly varied. As a result, there are no simple rules to planning a person's affairs for the event of death. However, some forethought and careful planning to minimize tax burdens will help achieve any estate planning goals as well as ease the financial burden on the family.

This chapter discusses some of the major considerations in establishing an estate plan.

WILLS

Transferring assets by means of a will is known as bequeathing. The necessity and importance of preparing a will to direct the distribution of property in your estate cannot be stressed enough. Yet, in spite of its importance, many people die without having made a will, causing a great deal of unnecessary and expensive problems.

The farm property usually represents the major asset of most farmers. By having a will, the farmer leaves instructions on how he/she wishes his/her property to be distributed. The individuals he/she selects as executors of his/her estate will collect and inventory his/her property, pay off any debts and taxes, and distribute the property remaining as directed by the will. Without a will, there is no indication as to how the farmer wanted his/her property distributed. Having a plan through a will can help avoid excess taxes on the deemed disposition of assets at death, and aids in distributing the deceased farmer's property to the beneficiaries of his choice.

If a person dies without leaving a will, his/her estate will generally be divided by the provisions of a provincial intestate succession act. An intestate succession act, basically, provides a will for that person and cannot take into consideration the needs of each particular family. As a result, some untoward results can arise. For example, in Alberta, when a person dies without a will (called dying intestate) and the estate has a net value of less than $40,000, the entire estate shall go to the spouse. Where the net value of the estate is greater than $40,000, the surviving spouse shall receive $40,000 and the balance is divided as follows:

- If the person dies leaving a spouse and one child, one-half of the remainder goes to the spouse and one-half to the child.
- If the person dies leaving a spouse and more than one child, one third of the remainder goes to the spouse and the other two thirds is divided equally among the children.
- Where there are no children, the surviving spouse receives the entire estate.

If a person dies interstate and there is no surviving spouse or children, the estate shall go to the deceased's nearest kin. When no heirs survive the deceased, the estate will generally go to the Crown.

As is evident from the above discussion, dying intestate will result in property being divided according to provincial laws. The final distribution of property in the estate may not bear any similarities to the wishes of the deceased.

Both husband and wife should sit down with a lawyer and each have a will drawn up, if only to avoid the administrative problems which arise when a person dies intestate. Once a will is made, it is easily altered to meet changing conditions and wishes as times goes on. Therefore it should be kept up to date.

DEEMED DISPOSITION

With the tax reform of 1971, the federal government abandoned its estate and gift tax legislation and, instead, brought in a tax on accrued gains of capital property which is gifted or bequested. Thus, a gift of capital property or property that passes to an heir on the death of a taxpayer is subject to a *deemed disposition.* A taxpayer is deemed to have disposed of his capital assets (other than depreciable assets of a prescribed class) at the time of gifting or immediately prior to his death, and to have received proceeds equal to the fair market value of those assets. Therefore, on any such property, the **fair market value** must be deter-

mined and any capital gain or loss resulting from this deemed sale must be declared on the taxpayer's tax return for the year, or on a deceased taxpayer's final income tax return. The recipient of the capital property that is gifted or bequested is deemed to have purchased the property for the same amount for which the property was deemed to have been sold.

Where property qualifies under any of the rollover provisions discussed earlier, the deemed disposition rules do not apply. Where a farmer is gifting or bequeathing property to heirs, it is important to ensure that he she meets the rollover rules to defer the taxes on the transfer of the property. As well, the above rules do not apply on the transfer of property to a spouse, or to bequests of cash.

Depreciable Assets

The deemed proceeds on depreciable assets of a prescribed class (declining balance method) is an amount half-way between fair market value of the assets in the class and the undepreciated capital cost of the class. The following example shows how this is calculated:

EXAMPLE

Capital Cost = $8,000
Fair Market Value = 6,800
Undepreciated Capital Cost = 4,900

$$\text{Deemed Proceeds} = \frac{\text{UCC} + \text{FMV}}{2}$$

$$= \frac{\$4,900 + 6,800}{2}$$

$$= \$5,850$$

Recaptured Capital Cost Allowance = Deemed Proceeds − UCC
= $5,850 − $4,900
= $ 950

In the above example, the taxpayer will be deemed to have received proceeds of $5,850. The recaptured capital cost allowance for the assets in the class ($950) will be included in the taxpayer's income for the taxation year in which he died. The deemed proceeds in the example are less than the capital cost, so there is no capital gain. Where a capital gain occurs, one-half would be added to the deceased's income and taxed at normal rates.

Where a farmer has assets on the straight-line method of capital cost allowance, the assets are transferred at the fair market value without the incidence of recapture. The beneficiary of the asset must then claim capital cost allowance on the declining balance method. As well, he/she is deemed to have acquired the property at a cost equal to the deemed proceeds of the deceased.

Again, for depreciable property being transferred to children the rollover rules may apply. Under these provisions, declining balance assets are transferred at their undepreciated capital cost (book value).

ACTUAL DISPOSITIONS

The deemed proceeds of disposition established at death may vary from those amounts subsequently realized on an actual subsequent disposal. In this situation, the act permits an adjustment for losses incurred within 12 months after death. If the estate disposes of capital property within 12 months and incurs an overall loss, the deceased's income is recalculated with any resulting tax saving treated as tax prepayment for the estate. In effect, the loss has been carried back to offset the gain accrued at the time of death.

An exception to the capital loss carry forward provisions allows any unabsorbed capital losses, in the year the taxpayer dies to be applied against any income for the year of death and for the immediately preceding year.

RIGHTS OR THINGS

There is also a deemed realization on assets of an income nature, such as grain, livestock and other farm products which are on hand at the date of death. These must be included on the final income tax return and are termed the deceased's "rights or things".

There are a few options available for filing income tax returns on the value of "rights or things":

- The value of "rights or things" may be filed along with the return filed for the entire estate.
- A separate return may be filed for the "rights or things" on hand at the time of death as if it were for a separate individual entitled to all personal exemptions.
- The "rights or things" may be transferred to the beneficiaries at the deceased's cost base immediately before his/her death, the beneficiaries become responsible for declaring the income received from their realization or the income earned on such realization.

Further information is available from Revenue Canada in a booklet: *Supplementary Guide T1 Income Tax Returns for Deceased Persons.*

TRUSTS

It is possible for a farmer to leave the farming business in trust under his will. When a farmer dies leaving a spouse and children, the trust could oper-

ate so that the spouse could receive income from the farming business for life. Then, upon the spouse's death, the farm property would be divided among the surviving children as indicated by the will. In some cases, this may be a practical and desirable approach to estate planning.

The Income Tax Act provides special rules for the establishment and use of trusts, and, basically, allows the spouse rollover and the farm rollover to be combined to defer tax by using trusts. To qualify, the trust for the spouse must first meet all of the rules necessary for the spouse rollover. Either a trust arising at death or a trust established while the farmer is alive will qualify. The rules for the farm property itself, in using a trust, are as follows:

Canadian Property

As discussed earlier, the property must be land or depreciable property which is situated in Canada, or interest in a family farm partnership, or a share in a family farm corporation.

Qualified Spousal Trust[1]

The property must vest indefeasibly in a "qualified spousal trust" within 15 months from the date of death (whether the trust arises on the death of the individual or is established during his lifetime). If the trust is a non-qualified spousal trust[2], the rollovers are lost and the property will be deemed to have been disposed at fair market value under the present income tax law. It is important to get professional help when setting up a spousal trust to avoid disqualifying it for the rollover.

Vesting on Death of the Spouse

When the spouse for whom the trust was set up dies, the property must be transferred or distributed to a child or children (who are resident in Canada) at the time of the spouse's death.

The Property Must be Used in the Business of Farming

The property must be **used** in the business of farming by someone. However, there is no specific requirement that the taxpayer, his/her spouse, or child be actively farming when it is rolled into the trust or when the property is rolled out of the trust to the children.

If the above rules are met, the use of a trust to transfer property to a spouse and then to a child will be possible, using a tax-deferred rollover.

LIFE ESTATES

If a farmer is in a position to retire, and he/she does not need to sell the property to provide for his/her retirement, the creation of a life estate may be an appropriate estate plan. To set up this arrangement, a farmer would "partition" the property retaining a life interest for himself/herself and his/her spouse and, transferring a remainderman interest to his children. Upon the death of the parents, the life estate title merges into the remainderman title. The parents have a right to the income from the property as long as they live.

There is some controversy about whether or not this would qualify under the farm rollovers as discussed earlier. Revenue Canada's present position appears to be that this procedure will qualify for the rollover providing the other requirements of the provisions are met. The land would rollover at the farmer's adjusted cost base with no adjustment for the life interest. On the death of the life tenants, there would not be deemed disposition of the life interest.

Some of the benefits of using this approach are as follows:

- subsequent changes in tax laws will not affect the rollover
- where a farmer wishes to retire but does not have any children interested in farming, he can complete this rollover while he is still in the business of farming
- the child who has the remainderman interest can use the land as if he was leasing it with knowledge that he will eventually acquire full title to it
- as the land will not go into the estate, probate fees would be reduced.

As this area is quite complex, it is strongly recommended that professional advice be sought.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Forward Averaged Amounts

Where an individual has elected to forward average a part of his income, this amount will be included in the return for the year of death. To the extent that the marginal tax rate in the year of death is less than the forward averaged tax rate, a saving of tax will arise.

---

[1] A "Qualified Spousal Trust" is one in which the spouse alone receives income or capital during his/her lifetime

[2] A "Non-qualified Spousal Trust" is one where the spouse and others may receive income or capital or the continuation of the trust is dependent on some future action of the spouse i.e. remarriage

Reserves in the Year of Death

A capital gain reserve in respect of the gain included in a person's income is not available in the year of death. The entire taxable capital gain that is remaining must be included in the individual's income for the year of death, even though it will not be received until a future date. This applies except where a resident spouse is the beneficiary.

Restricted Farm Loss in Year of Death

A restricted farm loss in the year of death will not be allowed to offset income of the farm earned by the estate. For tax purposes, the estate is considered a separate individual and, therefore, it cannot take over the restricted farm loss of the decedent. If the farm is to be disposed of, a portion (interest and taxes) of the restricted farm loss for the year of death may be applied to reduce any capital gain realized on this disposition.

CONCLUSION

This publication has discussed a number of tax strategies available to the farm manager. Although the strategies presented are by no means exhaustive, they illustrate the importance of tax planning to the farm business. Such strategies are important in the short term, and may have long-term implications as well.

It is important to keep in mind the objective of tax planning is to **maximize income after tax.**

Up-to-date financial records are necessary so that planning can be done before the year end. The individual with the greatest knowledge of his her farm business is the farm manager. He she must have an understanding of the implications of various tax rules in order to ask the appropriate questions of his her tax advisor. In this way, the tax advisor can best assist the farmer in evaluating various alternatives. The farm manager can then decide which tax alternatives are best for guiding his her farm business towards achieving both economic and personal goals.

APPENDIX

FEDERAL RATES OF TAX
FEDERAL TAX – 1983*

Taxable Income	Tax	On Next
$ 0	$ 0 + 6%	$ 1,179
1,179	71 + 16	1,179
2,358	259 + 17	2,358
4,716	660 + 18	2,358
7,074	1,085 + 19	4,716
11,790	1,981 + 20	4,716
16,506	2,924 + 23	4,716
21,222	4,009 + 25	11,790
33,012	6,956 + 30	23,580
56,592	14,030 + 34	Excess

FEDERAL TAX – 1984*

Taxable Income	Tax	On Next
$ 0	$ 0 + 6%	$ 1,238
1,238	74 + 16	1,238
2,476	272 + 17	2,476
4,952	693 + 18	2,476
7,428	1,139 + 19	4,952
12,380	2,080 + 20	4,952
17,332	3,070 + 23	4,952
22,284	4,209 + 25	12,380
34,664	7,304 + 30	24,760
59,424	14,732 + 34	Excess

* Federal Tax Reduction: $200 – 1983; $200 – 1984, reduced by 10% of Federal tax payable in excess of $6,000.

PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS
(Federal)

	1983	1984
Single individual	$ 3,770	$ 3,960
Spouse	3,300	2,470
Married status	$ 7,070	$ 7,430
Income limit of spouse	$ 570	$ 490
Child uner 18	710	710
Income limit of child under 18	2,450	2,350
Child 18 or over	1,300	1,360
Income limit of child 18 or over	2,570	2,600
Taxpayer over 64	1,300	1,360
Blind or disabled	2,360	2,480
Refundable child tax credit per child	343	360
Threshold family income for full refundable child tax credit benefits	26,330	26,330
Maximum Canada Pension Plan contribution – employee	300.60	338.40
– self-employed	601.20	676.80

PROVINCIAL RATES OF TAX
(Subject to 1984 Budget Changes)

	1983	1984
British Columbia	44.0%	44.0%
Alberta	38.5	43.5
Saskatchewan	51.0	51.0
Manitoba	54.0	54.0
Ontario	49.2	50.4
New Brunswick	58.0	58.0
Nova Scotia	56.5	56.5
Prince Edward Island	52.5	52.5
Newfoundland	60.0	60.0
Yukon	45.0	45.0
North West Territories	43.0	43.0
Non-Residents	47.0	47.0

LISTING OF PUBLICATIONS & ARTICLES

Prepared by the Farm Business Management Branch as of January, 1984

INCOME TAX

Capital Cost Allowance – Tables for Quick Calculations

Capital Cost Allowance Provisions After the 1981 Budget, November 1982 (FS837-15)

Change a Loss to a Gain with a Five-Year Block Average, Rev. September 1983, (FS837-5)

Commodity Trading and Taxes, April 1981 (FS837-8)

Farm Tax and the Livestock Inventory Provision, Rev. September 1983 (FS837-9)

Fast Tax Write-offs for Farmers, December 1981 (FS837-12)

How Quota Transfers are Taxed, November 1983 (FS837-17)

New Forward Averaging Begins in 1982, November 1982 (FS837-14)

Registered Retirement Savings Plans & Registered Home Ownership Savings Plans, Dec. 1979 (Agdex 838-1)

Reporting Unusual Farm Income for Tax Purposes, July 1981 (FS837-10)

Tax and the Farm Family, November 1980 (FS837-6)

Tax Considerations When Relocating a Business, Revised 1980 (FS837-4)

Tax Implications of Taking up Residence in Another Country, November 1982 (FS837-13)

*Tax Treatment of Tree Farmers, 1977

Tips and Traps in Farm Rollovers, March 1981 (FS838-7)

ESTATE PLANNING & BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS

Cow-Calf Leasing Arrangements, April 1982 (FS812-3)

Custom Farming Agreement, January 1981 (Agdex 817-10)

Farm Business Contracts, March 1981 (Agdex 817-9)

Farm Business Incorporation, March 1981 (Agdex 817-4)

Farm Business Partnerships, August 1980 (Agdex 817-1)

Farm Business Partnerships, Sample Agreement Clauses, July 1980 (Agdex 817-2)

Farm Estate Planning (Presently out of print)

Joint Ventures, December 1983 (Agdex 812-6)

Principles of Law for Rural Alberta, University of Alberta 1981

FARM COMPUTERS

A First Look at Farm Computers, October 1979 (FS818-7)

Alberta Farm Computer Course (Brochure)

Best of Compu-Farm, Volumes 1-3 (Agdex 818-23)

Buying Computer Hardware, April 1982 (FS818-11)

*Compu-Farm Monthly Newsletter

How to Select the Right Farm Accounting Software (Agdex 818-22)

FARM ACCOUNTING & RECORD KEEPING

Developing a Farm Office Procedure, Agrifax April 1983 (FS818-17)

Farm Accounting and Management Terms, July 1983 (Agdex 818-19)

Farm Record Keeping, Rev. January 1984 (FS818-4)

Guide to Physical Record Systems for Alberta Farmers, August 1982 (Agdex 818-5)

How to Select an Accountant and Obtain Maximum Benefits, July 1982 (FS818-14)

*Income & Expenses – Basic Records for Alberta Farmers

Investigating Sources of Profit I, Analyzing the Balance Sheet, April 1982 (FS818-12)

Investigating Sources of Profit II, Analyzing the Income Statement, April 1982 (FS818-13)

*Management Depreciation, Capital Cost Allowance and Estimated Values, 1976

*Prairie Provinces Farm Account Book (Agdex 818-1)

*Prairie Provinces Farm Account Book – Guide (Agdex 818)

Preparing and Using Net Worth Statements, December 1980 (FS818-8)

Recording Transactions in your Farm Record Book (Agdex 818-24)

Selecting a Farm Business Record System, December 1980 (FS810-10)

Using Your Farm Bank Account, December 1980 (FS818-2)

What Am I Worth? The Net Worth Statement August 1977 (FS818-3)

CUSTOM RATES & FARM MACHINERY ECONOMICS

Custom Rates – Annual Survey Summary 1983 (Agdex 825-9)

*Custom Rates Survey – Various Topics – 7 per year (Continuing Series)

Directory of Custom Operators in Alberta – 1984

Farm Machinery Costs as a Guide to Custom Rates, Spring 1984 (Agdex 825-4)

Know Your Farm Machinery Costs, Rev. January 1984 (Agdex 825-6)

*Knowing Your Machine Capacity, 1977

Leasing Farm Machinery, June 1982 (FS825-13)

Planning Farm Machinery Costs, August 1977 (FS825-5)

Self-Propelled or Pull-Type Combine, December 1980 (Agdex 825-7)

What is a Fair Charge for Custom Work? July 1983 (FS825-15)

LAND LEASING (CROPS & PASTURES)

Land Leasing Agreements in Alberta, With Worksheets & Sample Forms, 1979 (Agdex 812-4)

Leasing Cropland in Alberta, June 1981 (Agdex 812-5)

*Pasture Rental Decision Kit, 1980

CREDIT, RISK & FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Are Your Farming for Cash or Profit? December 1982 (FS818-16)

Assistance Available to Alberta Farmers, July 1983 (Agdex 871)

Controlling Farm Input Costs, October 1983 (FS818-21)

Farm Cash Management – Cash Budgeting I, January 1982 (FS831-1)

Farm Cash Management – Making Money From Cash Management II, April 1982 (FS831-2)

Farm Debt Consolidation, is it the Answer for You? January 1984 (FS832-4)

Farm Insurance, March 1977 (FS838-2)

Financial Management Package, June 1980 (Agdex 810)

Fire Insurance for Farmers, December 1981 (FS838-4)

Foreclosure, Receivership, Bankruptcy and the Alberta Farmer, December 1983 (Agdex 832-3)

Liability Insurance for Farmers, July 1981 (FS838-3)

Managing Your Working Capital, May 1983 (FS818-18)

Money to Start a Farm, Rev. August 1982 (FS832-1)

Revolving Credit Accounts, August 1977 (FS832-2)

Sources of Farm Business Credit in Alberta, June 1983 (Agdex 832)

The 3 C's and 3 R's of Credit (FS832-5)

FARM BUSINESS ANALYSIS & ENTERPRISE BUDGETING

Analyzing a Farm Business, Rev. November 1983 (Agdex 818-20)

*Canfarm Farm Business Analysis, 1972-1978

*Condensed Farm Business Analysis – Input Forms & Instructions, 1979 (Agdex 818-7)

Control Your Financial Future by Analyzing your Farm's Finances, October 1982 (FS818-15)

*Detailed Farm Business Analysis – Input Forms & Instructions, 1979 (Agdex 818-6)

Establishing Benchmarks for Key Result Areas in a Farm Enterprise, Sept. 1983 (FS810-1)

*Feedlot Management, January 1981

PLANNING & DECISION MAKING

A Price for Standing Hay, December 1980 (Agdex 821-8)

Beef Confinement Barns in Alberta, 1979 (Agdex 816-1)

Deciding on a Two-Way Communication System for your Farm, July 1983 (FS825-16)

Does it Pay to Cover Hay? December 1980 (Agdex 827-1)

Does Summerfallow Pay? 1977 (FS821-6)

Economics of Alternative Methods of Anhydrous Ammonia Application, March 1983 (FS825-14)

*Economics of Forage Systems, 1977

*Farm Management Principles and Planning

Farming with High Inflation & Interest Rates, August 1982 (FS811-1)

Fencing Costs, 1980 (Agdex 824-2)

Land Clearing and Breaking Costs, December 1980 (Agdex 825-8)

Land Purchase Decision Package, 1979

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

An Introduction to Wind Power – Its Uses and Potential

*Energy Audit, January 1981

*Farm Management Data Manual (fee $10.00), December 1981

Incentive Plans for the Farm Employee, May 1981 (FS823-2)

Labour Management in Agriculture, 1980 (Agdex 823)

Oilseed and Specialty Crop Contractors, February 1981 (FS140/842-1)

Programs to Offset Farmers' Energy Costs, January 1982 (FS828-2)

Saving Energy in Dairy Operations, January 1981 (FS824-6)

Saving Energy in Hog Operations, January 1981 (FS824-7)

Publications, except those marked with an asterisk, are available from:

Alberta Agriculture
Print Media Branch
7000 – 113 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T6H 5T6

*All Publications Marked With an Asterisk are Available only in Olds:
Alberta Agriculture
Farm Business Management Branch
Box 2000
Olds, Alberta T0M 1P0
Telephone: 556-4240